

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition

THE words 'perfect' and 'perfection' have a secure and unassailable place in the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Bible. Where they apply to Christ, they raise no difficulties. Where they refer to Christians, as they often do, they present serious problems. Can these words, in view of the sinful nature of man, ever be relevant to our poor human nature, even when it has been redeemed? The New Testament, however, so uses them; therefore we must try to come to terms with them, as best we may. We cannot, for instance, avoid the plain insistence of our Lord in Mt 5<sup>48</sup>: 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect'; and the writer to the Hebrews with unmistakable clarity summons his readers to 'press on unto perfection' (6<sup>1</sup>).

It is true that some commentators have asked whether, in fact, the English word 'perfect' does not misrepresent the Greek word which it translates. Some have suggested that in Mt 5<sup>48</sup> the Aramaic word which Jesus used, and which is rendered in Greek by τέλειος, meant 'generous' or 'tender-hearted' rather than 'perfect'. But in fact we do not know what Aramaic word was used. All we do know is that τέλειος stands in the Greek text and this is normally translated 'perfect'. Indeed, in this particular context even the modern versions feel compelled to retain the customary translation, even though elsewhere they prefer variations. In He 6<sup>1</sup>, for instance, the Revised Standard Version translates: 'Go on to maturity', though it should be noted that in He 2<sup>10</sup>, when what is essentially the same word is used in reference to Jesus, the rendering 'perfect' is retained: the pioneer of our salvation is made perfect through suffering.

In view of the ambiguity of these words, a thorough examination and assessment of them is desirable, and this has been provided in a book entitled *The Idea of Perfection in the New Testa-*

*ment*, written by a South African scholar, P. J. DU PLESSIS.<sup>1</sup> If the book provides evidence of the difficulties in understanding precisely what the Greek word τέλειος meant in the New Testament rather than precisely supplies that meaning, that is due to the perplexity of the subject rather than the fault of the author.

First of all Dr. DU PLESSIS reviews the interpretations which have been given to the word 'perfect' in its New Testament contexts. The first is its 'moral connotation', which 'imposes absolutism as indispensable in the Christian imperative'. John Wesley is cited as the chief representative of this school of thought. He urged that Christian perfection meant love of God and love of one's neighbour; that such love could be received by faith; and that one did not need to wait for it till the moment of death but could receive it 'here and now'. He was careful to insist, however, that this perfect love did not mean freedom from ignorance or error; but it did mean freedom from any deliberate intention to disobey the known will of God. It is worth noting that Wesley preached this urgently not only in the first flush of his own conversion experience, but right up to the end of his very long life. When confronted with bitter criticism of his doctrine, he simply but firmly took his stand on the words of Jesus in Mt 5<sup>48</sup>, which have already been quoted.

Other exponents have denounced this attempt to read a predominantly moral significance into the word. Some prefer an 'eschatological interpretation', leaving all realisation of perfection to the new age which lies beyond this present one. Others support a 'formal interpretation', claiming that the word means 'mature' and was used as a suitable description of any fully accepted member of the community. Others advocate a 'mystical interpretation', and plead that 'perfect' is used

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Kok, Kampen; F. 6-90.

to describe not moral conduct, but a man's relationship with God, when it is restored to what God meant it to be. Still others claim that the word was used in the mystery religions for an 'initiate', who had been given some secret, esoteric knowledge, and so it came to describe the ordinary church member who had received baptism.

The author, however, shows more sympathy with those who seek the background of the word, not so much in pagan associations, but rather in the Septuagint and its Hebrew origins, and it is noted that the Hebrew words rendered by τέλειος indicate primarily one who is in a right relationship with God, and who in consequence is consistently obedient to the known will of God. This inseparable combination of spiritual relationship with God and moral obedience to God is characteristic of the Old Testament at its best.

The main body of the book is a detailed examination of the uses of the word τέλειος (and also of words cognate with it, especially the noun τέλος) in secular Greek, in the Septuagint (with some special reference to the evidence from the Qumran literature), in Philo, and in the New Testament. It is a careful and scholarly presentation of the relevant material, and will be invaluable to anyone who wishes to pursue this study closely. The general reader will, however, be interested in his conclusions.

The author is not persuaded that there is proof that the word τέλειος was used to describe one who had been initiated into a mystery religion, and is not inclined therefore to find such a meaning in the New Testament. A better guide is the Septuagint, where, he writes, the word implied 'total submission to the will of God, absolute dependence and devotion to His service' and 'unimpeded relationship with Him'.

In the New Testament the word springs into a prominence not found either in secular Greek or in the Septuagint. This is because the central theme of the New Testament is the proclamation of a 'fulfilment'. Christ had carried to its conclusion (τέλος) the long-promised redemption. Indeed He Himself was this conclusion (its τέλος), and this fundamental faith about Christ lies behind the use of the cognate word τέλειος.

In Paul the word means one who has entered into the full redemption made available in Christ, and therefore the word can be applied to all Christians. The moral connotation is, however,

implicit in the word, since it means also one who 'strives to be in accordance with the will of God'. In view of the frailty of human nature, however, there continues to be a 'future perspective' in the word, since full perfection belongs to the 'age to come'.

The author finds a 'remarkable agreement' between Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews in their teaching on this matter, though in Hebrews there is the unique use of the word 'perfect' in relation to Christ as well as to Christians. Their agreement is found in their mutual insistence that perfection is not an individual attainment. It is achieved in the life of men by the grace of God in Christ.

James also gives an emphatic place to perfection. Here the root meaning is of 'whole-hearted devotion' to God, as in the Old Testament. It is, however, not only a status conferred on the Christian. It is also a goal he must reach out for. 'Perfection for James is not only faith embracing grace, but is also constituted by an accompanying dynamic imperative.'

Dr. DU PLESSIS is rather critical of John Wesley's insistence on the moral quality of perfection, but one cannot help feeling that the summary of his teaching, given earlier, had much in common with that of the New Testament.

---

The world owes much to Quaker thought and Quaker life, and the latest Swarthmore Lecture, *The Castle and the Field: An Essay in the Psychology of Religion*, by HAROLD LOUKES,<sup>1</sup> is a book of great interest and of not a little importance.

The book takes its title from the picture in which it sees life. The Castle is the world of the Church, the private world of religion, the world of orthodoxy and dogma and conventional and established and accepted belief. The Field is the world at large. For long enough the Castle of the Church was comfortably serene and safe and secure. But in the last four centuries the Castle was subjected to three devastating attacks. There was first the attack of Galileo and Copernicus. This provided us with the conception of a world, not of God, but of scientific law; but it was still possible at least to say that, although God did not operate, as it were, freely in the Field, His laws certainly did. Then came Darwin, and the result of Darwin's thought was to show a process of evolution so wasteful and so blind and so extravagant that the

<sup>1</sup> Allen and Unwin; cloth 6s. net, paper 4s. 6d. net.

very idea of purpose in the Field seemed no longer tenable. And, finally, there came the most devastating attack of all, the attack of Freud, which seemed to attack the very Castle itself, by pointing to 'the ways in which men deceive themselves, believing what they wish were true, so that the very hunger for certainty becomes a mark of immaturity'. The result of this is that men were confronted with the shattering idea that the very Castle itself might well be nothing more than illusion. Mr. LOUKES well points out that, if it is possible to see religion as nothing more than the projection of infantile dependence, it is surely equally possible to see atheism as nothing more than the projection of infantile hate.

Now the Christian must live in the Field, and Mr. LOUKES quotes Barclay, the famous Quaker writer, as laying it down that the great enemy is not atheism, 'taking with few, because odious', but false religion, 'the constant ruin of the world', and in its falsehood indeed the source of atheism, 'for these many and various opinions of God and religion, being so much mixed up with the guessings and uncertain judgments of men, have begotten in many the opinion that there is no God at all'. The Christian may well learn from the scientist and might well take the words of Huxley as his own: 'Science seems to me to teach in the highest and strongest manner the great truth which is embodied in the Christian conception of entire surrender to the will of God. Sit down before the fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, follow humbly wherever and to whatever abysses Nature leads, or you shall learn nothing. I have only begun to learn content and peace of mind since I have resolved at all risks to do this.'

Mr. LOUKES has certain very practical tests. He lays it down as a first principle that 'a healthy religion will produce healthy personality'. 'If it produces neurosis and breakdown, then it is illusion.' Barclay believed that 'true religion will reveal itself in the fulfilment of personality'. 'The operation of religion on human personality is surely the starting-point for one enquiry among others as to "whether it be illusion or no".' This connects with Mr. LOUKES' demands from psychology. Psychology ought to be a great instrument for the Christian because it does claim to sit down before the fact of human personality. But the trouble with so much psychological study is that it is concerned with the abnormal. The psychologist and the analyst might, and indeed do, claim that all men are a little mad; but it would be equally, perhaps more, correct to claim that all

men are a little sane! 'There is more to be learned of the human condition from the observation of personal fulfilment than of conflict and despair.'

But let us look more particularly at the more essentially Quaker things in this book. The Quaker position stresses the supreme importance of the inner light as against all laws and dogmas and conventions. This naturally stresses the individual. 'When all is known, there will be something unknown, something unpredictable and inexplicable in the human condition. The scientist regards this as a pity: the Christian sees it as an opportunity for grace.' The basic Quaker testimony and assertion is that 'each human life presents the universe with a new situation, in which something may happen that has never happened before; and that it is precisely in this novelty, this opportunity for creative behaviour, that the secret of humanity lies.'

But the Quaker's stress on the inner light does not lead to individualism run riot. There is need of faith. 'No man is safe without faith, in the sense of an underlying view of life which offers him a means of interpreting the chaos of experience, a guide that, like the scientist's theory, tells him where to look and what to pay attention to, a point of reference to which he can turn in his doubts'. Further, the inner light does not do away with the need for study and knowledge and research into history. 'We cannot venture into the Field without the Bible and the story of the Church, not because they tell us how to behave, but because they are the account of what life in the Field is like. They tell us what man has looked like when he has been found of God, man *sub specie aeternitatis*, man under the view of eternity.'

In the Quaker position there is a certain danger, because the Quaker has very definite traditions of speech, dress, behaviour. That is as it should be, but it is well to remember that a 'traditional testimony becomes dangerous only when it is a way of avoiding thought. . . . To abide by a testimony may be simply to have our minds made up for us'.

This is a small book; it runs to no more than eighty pages; but it is a book which from beginning to end never ceases to grapple both with ultimate reality and with the present situation. Whether a man be a Quaker or not, he will find this a book which at one and the same time speaks to his condition and compels him to think.

## Significant Modern Writers

W. H. Auden

BY PROFESSOR W. B. J. MARTIN, D.D., PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, DALLAS, TEXAS

ON the eve of Auden's election to the Oxford Chair of Poetry in 1956, I prepared a lecture for the University of Edinburgh Literary Society on 'W. H. Auden—Protestant Poet'. The first people I saw in the audience were two Roman Catholic nuns, so I hastily jettisoned the first title and improvised a new one, using a line from the poem, *September 1, 1939*, 'We must love one another or die.' To my pleased surprise, the nuns were the first to come forward to voice appreciation of the talk, which only goes to show that truth will prevail if one does not protest overmuch about the label! In any event, it is under *both* these titles that I now propose to consider Auden as a 'significant modern writer'.

I

That Wystan Hugh Auden is a Christian poet there is no doubt. Like Edwin Muir, whose conversion to Christianity consisted in awakening to the realization that he had always been a Christian, 'no matter how bad a one', so, under the shock of contemporary events, Auden awoke to the real nature of his beliefs. With T. S. Eliot, to whom he obviously owes a great deal, he might have written:

We shall not cease from exploration  
And the end of our exploring  
Will be to arrive where we started  
And know the place for the first time.

(*Little Gidding*, 43)

The exploration, certainly, is evident in all Auden's work. His acceptance of the Faith was only possible after every other alternative had been scrutinized and tested, and after every other road had proved a dead-end. When he came 'to know the place for the first time', he discovered that he had been guided thereto by three major sign posts: first, an experience during the Spanish Civil War, in Barcelona in 1937, where he found the churches closed, and was jolted out of his easy-going liberalism; then, a meeting, purely on business,

with the poet and novelist Charles Williams, in whom he encountered real saintliness; and, finally, a viewing of the Nazi film, *Sieg im Poland*, with its brutally cynical assumption that might is right. He asked himself, 'If I think this wrong, on what do I base the values to dispute the implications of materialism?'

Auden's avowed acceptance of the Christian Faith has undoubtedly alienated many who formerly admired and followed him: it partly accounts for the almost sneering disdain in which his work is held by some 'modern' poets and critics. They cannot, of course, deny that he is a considerable poet, perhaps the greatest next to T. S. Eliot, but they are scandalized by his capitulation to a dogmatic position. He was interesting as long as he was a seeker; his offence is that he has become a finder. They admired him as long as he was exposing the muddle and corruption of modern society, but he has committed the unforgivable sin of following the light he was given to its logical conclusion. Auden himself seems to have had some inkling of this when, in the *Litany of S. Matthew's Day*, prepared for the patronal festival at St. Matthew's Church, Northampton, he wrote with witty perception: 'Deliver us, we pray thee, . . . from the temptation, stronger perhaps in our present age than in earlier times, to pray, if we pray at all: "I thank thee, O Lord, that I am an interesting sinner and not as this Pharisee"'.

Yet, Auden is no hide-bound dogmatist; his commitment is not to a system but to a candid and ever-renewed encounter with reality. This is what I mean by calling him a Protestant poet. He is Protestant, not in any narrow denominational sense, though his affiliation is with the Anglican Church, but because his is an essentially Protestant attitude to life; committed yet open, intelligent but not intellectual, evangelical rather than sacramentarian. For Auden, faith is not merely the assent of the intellect to a system of religious propositions, though no poet of our time has such a well-stored and searching mind as his, but an

encounter with the living God in the wide range of human experience, not confined, as with most Catholic writers, to 'religious' themes but experienced in the full sweep of secular life. With Paul Tillich he holds that 'religion is not a special function of man's spiritual life, but it is the dimension of depth in all of its functions'.

His essentially Protestant attitude of commitment in freedom, of the willingness to encounter the judgment of the living God in all life's experiences, is finely expressed at the end of his most avowedly Christian work, *For the Time Being: A Christmas Oratorio*:

He is the Way.

Follow Him through the Land of Unlikeness:

You will see rare beasts, and have unique adventures.

He is the Truth.

Seek Him in the Kingdom of Anxiety;

You will come to a great city that has expected your return for years.

He is the Life.

Love Him in the world of the Flesh:

And at your marriage all its occasions shall dance for joy.

Auden is Protestant, also, in his stress on the importance of the Word. It is the Word which quickens and illumines, that cleanses the senses, and organizes and redeems the emotions. Because of his belief in the Word, Auden rules out idolatry, magic, and heathen mysticism. As he puts it in a prose passage of *For the Time Being*: 'Because in Him the Flesh is united to the Word without magical transformation, Imagination is redeemed from promiscuous fornication with her own images. . . . Reason is redeemed from incestuous fixation on her own Logic. . . . Because of His visitation, we may no longer desire God as if He were lacking; our redemption is no longer a question of pursuit but of surrender to Him who is always and everywhere present.'

But the Word, for Auden, is the Word within the word, which gives him his great freedom as an artist. Wyndham Lewis once declared that, whereas T. S. Eliot had given young poets 'a terror of speech—a fear of the word', Auden by his volubility and comparative carelessness had set them free. He performed this liberating service, I think, by using the word with rough Protestant vigour, uninhibited by scrupulous regard for sacramental formulae and the correct ritual phrase. Certainly, no other modern poet has anything like Auden's command of variety of poetic styles. As the doyen of American critics, Edmund Wilson, has expressed it: 'In metrics, in architectonics, as well as in the handling of language, he is, of course, an incredible virtuoso—the most accomplished poet in English since the

great nineteenth-century masters; Tennyson, Browning and Swinburne; he does not call attention to this, and many people who read him do not even know it'. With this great freedom, he can be lyrical and epic, exuberant and restrained; he is often colloquial, slangy, careless, slipshod, immensely cerebral, witty, clever, sometimes to the point of smartness; but he is never afraid of the word, nor of risking failure. His tremendous vitality has flowered into love lyrics, passionate protests like *Refugee Blues*, tributes to Freud, Yeats, Forster and Toller, long philosophical and religious works like *The Age of Anxiety*, *The Enchaféd Flood*, *For the Time Being*, and *The Shield of Achilles*, and a great body of literary criticism.

But, above all, Auden is Protestant in his acceptance of vocation and the determination to live on the frontiers of human existence, to touch the growing edges of life. He has always been found where great issues are emerging, always alert to the new movements competing for men's loyalties—Marxism, Freudianism, scientific humanism, striving to relate his own and other men's individual experiences to a unifying view of life. This search for a unifying pattern landed him at last within the Christian Church, but it is a mistake to think that he finds a haven within the Church; he accepts Christianity because its assessment of man is profounder than that of Marx or Freud, because it alone has measured the depth of man's evil, has fully recognized the ambivalence of human nature, and far from running away from it, has based the Faith upon it.

Auden is an immensely erudite man; his poetry and prose show an extensive and deep knowledge of Freud, and not only of Freud but of Groddeck (to whose psychoanalytical theories he was virtually the first to call attention in this country), of Marx, of Pascal, of Kierkegaard (a volume of whose selections he has edited and introduced), of Reinhold Niebuhr (to whom he dedicated his volume *Nones*), and of many others. His religious position, therefore, is a highly sophisticated one, aware of the alternatives, both secular and theological. There can hardly be a poet more relevant to those who seek to rescue religion from the moralism and sentimentalism that afflict it in our time.

## II

'We must love one another or die', wrote Auden in the significantly entitled *September 1, 1939*. The line might well serve as an epigraph to his whole work, despite the fact that in the revised issue of *Collected Shorter Poems* he deliberately struck it out, and the whole verse of which it was the

climax. Nevertheless, we can never forget that he did write it, and for many of us it still stands as the best short presentation of his attitude on the eve of the War—and after.

No doubt he suppressed the line in the interest of poetic theory. As he put it, 'Poetry is not concerned with telling people what to do, but with extending our knowledge of good and evil . . . making the necessity for action more urgent and its nature more clear'. He obviously feels now that the line was too declaratory, too didactic, and favours what Kierkegaard called the method of 'indirect communication'. However that may be, nothing can obliterate the strong impression that meets us everywhere in his work, early as well as late, that the problem for man is

'How to love and why'.

As early as in *On this Island*, he was saying :

. . . the word is love.

Surely one fearless kiss would cure

The million fevers.

His experience both in the Spanish War and with the practice of psychoanalysis had convinced him of the absolute necessity of love, in spite of the obvious difficulty of it, and of the havoc that is wrought in individual and social life through man's evasion of love, with its tremendous claims on his integrity. As he makes Malin say in *The Age of Anxiety* :

We would rather be ruined than changed,

We would rather die in our dread

Than climb the cross of the moment

And let our illusions die.

One of those illusions is vividly portrayed in *September 1, 1939* :

What mad Nijinsky wrote

About Diaghilev

Is true of the normal heart ;

For the error bred in the bone

Of each woman and each man

Craves what it cannot have,

Not universal love

But to be loved alone.

When Auden insists on the absolute necessity of love, he does so because of his conviction that only in loving is man true to his own nature : every refusal or evasion of love is a betrayal of essential humanity and wreaks its fearful vengeance in outcrops of psychic and physical perversions. We are all familiar with the thesis that sex repression is bad ; but Auden, following Groddeck, insists again and again on the far more serious dangers of the repression of love.

He makes this insistence, also, in full awareness of the impossibility of loving to order, by an act of will. He knows the truth behind William Blake's protest that willed-love is a monstrosity. 'There is no such thing as good will', Blake had said, 'the will is always evil', meaning that man's attempt to change himself according to a pattern prescribed by reason and moral codes, without reference to the unconscious and the instinctive, was bound to end in distortion. D. H. Lawrence had made this point with greater vehemence, saying that the Christian command to love one another was blasphemy, and that it was far better to hate one another, for hate was at least instinctive and spontaneous, whereas 'Christian' love was cold, calculated and barren. In spite of this, Auden insists that 'we *must* love one another or die', for he does not envisage love as an imposition of the will, but the recognition of reality, and as the response of the creature to the Creator.

We need to love all since we are

Each a unique particular

That is no giant, god or dwarf

But one odd human isomorph ;

We can love each because we know

All, all of us, that this is so :

Can live because we're loved ; the powers

That we create with are not ours.

(*New Year Letter*)

Man twists and turns in order to escape the necessity of love ; he thinks of a hundred substitutes for the real thing ; he constantly mistakes its real nature, which is as tough and realistic as any evil he encounters ; he knows he is unable to love. All this Auden has documented with clinical realism, but he has accepted the Christian Faith precisely because the Faith meets man's plight with God's grace. Auden is, above all things, the modern Protestant poet of grace—grace in the Person of Jesus Christ, offered to man that man might be put in touch with love, a love that does not spring from his own distorted centre, but out of the new and living relationship with God.

In *The Age of Anxiety*, a poem that has not only given a label to our age, but brilliantly described its characteristic sins and evasions, Auden brings the drama to its conclusion with the assertion of grace :

In our anguish we struggle

To elude Him, to lie to Him, yet His love observes His appalling promise ; His predilection

As we wander and weep is with us to the end, Minding our meanings. . . .

His Truth makes our theories historical sins,

It is where we are wounded that is when He speaks Our creaturely cry, concluding His children

In their mad unbelief to have mercy on them all

As they wait unawares for His World to come.

# A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel *(continued)*

BY PROFESSOR OSCAR CULLMANN, D.D., BASLE AND PARIS

(In Part I of this article Professor Cullmann discussed who the 'Hellenists' were, from whose number, according to Acts, Stephen and other leaders of the Early Church were recruited. He suggested they were a non-conformist group within Judaism, characterized by its opposition to the temple worship, an opposition shared by Stephen and also by the author of the Fourth Gospel.)

But first we must ask ourselves if this opposition to the temple can also be traced back to that non-conformist Judaism in which this very important branch of primitive Christianity has its roots. We can naturally find traces of an attitude critical of an over-estimation of the temple and sacrifices in the prophets of the Old Testament. Already the prophets tended to spiritualize the temple worship. Stephen himself cites Is 66: 'The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me?'

The passage Am 5<sup>25-27</sup>, which is cited by the Damascus document as well as in the Qumran texts and the speech of Stephen, each time it is true with a different intention, also attacks the sacrifices.

But it is evident that Stephen goes much further in his rejection of the temple than the prophets. He puts the construction of the temple on the same level of Israel's unfaithfulness in resisting the Holy Spirit as the making of the golden calf. A very bold thought indeed! In general scholars do not pay enough attention to the revolutionary character of Stephen's speech. Is this polemic found already in Qumran? If we ask the question in this way, we must probably answer 'No'. But if we ask on the other hand, was this polemic prepared for by the attitude of the Qumran sect, then we would have to answer 'Yes'. The texts, by the way, do not seem altogether clear on this subject. It is also possible that this sect, for whom it was impossible to observe the worship of the temple of Jerusalem because they rejected in any case its priesthood, did not always have the same ideas in this respect. The Damascus document (xi. 19ff.) condemns only sacrifices offered in a state of impurity. Another passage (vi. 11, 14) however goes further. On the other hand, the passage in the Manual of Discipline (ix. 3 ff.), which is often cited in support of the idea that 'expiation is assured by irreproachable conduct rather

than by the flesh of holocausts and the fats of sacrifice' (an idea indeed which scarcely goes beyond the polemic of the Old Testament prophets), probably should be translated differently: 'Expiation is assured through the flesh of holocausts and the fats of sacrifice'. This passage would then say on the contrary that sacrifices are in principle necessary, and this interpretation seems to be confirmed by the writing called 'The War of Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness' (ii. 5-6, vii. 11), which gives precise instructions for the ideal worship, for the manner in which sacrifices are to be offered, and for the dress of the priests. Similarly, the Aramaic fragments found in Cave 2, according to the most likely interpretation, give a description of the new Jerusalem analogous to that of Ezekiel, where revelations of the future temple are seen in a vision.

Unless it is assumed that it is necessary to interpret this whole description allegorically, which is not at all probable, it is likely that the men of Qumran, who were conscious of representing the true priesthood, awaited in the future the re-establishment of the true worship which they themselves, the true priesthood, would ensure in the temple of Jerusalem. They probably considered, at least at certain times, that their separation from Jerusalem and its worship was only temporary. Thus could be explained that which we learn from Josephus in a passage which is incidentally not completely clear (*Ant.*, XVIII. i. 5), according to which the Essenes sent offerings to the temple of Jerusalem without however participating in its worship. They could not take part in the worship because they radically condemned the priests who had usurped the priesthood in Jerusalem. In place of the worship of sacrifices which they could not observe, they had their own rites, especially the baptisms and the sacred meals. But it is more than likely that that which was at first considered as a necessity dictated by the circumstances would more and more seem to be a *definitive* institution consonant with the Divine will. Although in principle the specific rites of Qumran were not at all considered to be *opposed* to the bloody sacrifices, the long exclusive practice of their particular rites, baptism and sacred meal, and the long abstention from sacrifices must have sooner or later given birth to the idea that sacrifices were not at all

pleasing to God. Thus Philo is able to say that the Essenes reject all animal sacrifices.

We know nothing about the attitude of John the Baptist with regard to the temple and its worship. But the fact that he as the son of a priest did not follow a priestly career seems to imply that he had repudiated the official worship.

The theory of the Jewish sectarians may have differed, but in any case we understand perfectly that the ground was *favourable* for an opposition to the temple and the sacrifices, in spite of the expectation of an ideal future temple. The two ideas could well go hand in hand, but the opposition to the temple in its present state was dominant. Here, then, is the bond between Qumran and Stephen, and, as we shall see, between both of them and the Fourth Gospel.

On the other hand, we find that the pseudo-Clementines, which adopt in part even in the smallest details the ideas and practices of Qumran, go much further than the Qumran sect on this question of the temple and sacrifices, and so approach on this point the attitude of Stephen. The pseudo-Clementines must be cited in this context of nonconformist Judaism with which we are occupied. They are actually much more Jewish than Christian, belonging, however, to this current of gnostic Judaism. The very purpose of the coming of Jesus the true prophet was for them to put an end through baptism to the cult of sacrifices in Jerusalem. He came into the world in order to extinguish through the water of baptism the fire lit by the high priest. The destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 was the punishment of the Jews because they continued the sacrifices of the temple which the true prophet had abolished. In the framework of this radicalism, by the way, there is no place for any priesthood. This is why Aaron is considered as the representative of the principle of evil, in opposition to Moses, while in the Qumran texts Aaron is, on the contrary, the object of the greatest veneration. This is, however, the only point on which the pseudo-Clementines differ from the Qumran texts, and again their radicalism is but a natural development so to speak of the attitude of Qumran with regard to the temple and its worship. There is a complete agreement, however, on this radical rejection between the pseudo-Clementines and the 'Hellenists' of Acts.

This brings us to Stephen's speech. Here, too, *Aaron* is at the origin of idolatry. There is the same negative judgment against Aaron, from whom the priesthood is descended. The making of the golden calf is the work of 'human hands' (Ac 7<sup>41</sup>), just as the temple of Solomon is the work of *human hands* (v. 48). It would be difficult to push this radicalism any further. Bo Reicke has shown very well in his analysis that the principal

idea of the whole review of the history of Israel which Stephen gives is that the essential Divine revelations were granted by God outside Canaan. They were not bound to a particular place. The mobile tabernacle, however, does not come under the accusation as formulated by Stephen, for it was made according to the model which God had shown to Moses. It was not bound to a particular place. David had asked for a dwelling for the house of Jacob. He was thinking thereby of Jerusalem. But Solomon, who had not understood anything about this, built a house for *God*. God does not dwell, however, in that which is made by human hands. At the bottom of this opposition there is without a doubt the idea of a spiritual temple, which, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is the community of disciples. For this is probably already the thought of Jesus when He speaks of a temple which is not made by 'human hands' (Mk 14<sup>58</sup>).

Still another bond links up the Hellenist opposition to the temple with anti-Jerusalem currents of Palestine: let us not forget that the Hellenists, when they were expelled from Jerusalem after the martyrdom of Stephen (although the Twelve were able to remain), turned toward Samaria and thus became the first *missionaries*, as we have already seen.

They went to Samaria. Why to Samaria? Because the inhabitants of this country, which had strongly undergone the influence of the paganism of syncretistic Hellenism, were half-Jews, who recognized the five books of Moses but rejected above all the *temple* of Jerusalem in favour of their own place of worship, the sacred Mount Gerizim. According to the Church Fathers, there was a 'Simonian' religion in Samaria, which appealed to the authority of Simon the Magician. The rôle of Simon must have been more important than the Book of Acts indicates. According to the pseudo-Clementines, he was the actual founder of a gnostic sect, in which Hellenistic and Jewish elements were combined in a characteristic fashion which recalls certain aspects of the syncretistic Judaism which we are studying. The preaching of the gospel by the group of Stephen's partisans in this half-Jewish country where syncretism was rampant was of great importance for the Christian mission. It is the natural transition from the Christian mission in Palestine to a Christian mission in the pagan world. That which interests us here is the fact that the Christians who were expelled from Jerusalem because of their rejection of the temple turned to preach the gospel of Jesus among precisely those heretical Jews of Samaria who also had long rejected (of course for other reasons) the cult of the temple of Jerusalem.

This brings us to the Fourth Gospel. We saw a while ago that the Fourth Gospel is particularly

interested in these Hellenists, since it rehabilitates them in ch. 4. We shall now go one step further. Just as the valiant Hellenists, the Fourth Gospel also has a particular interest in Samaria, that half-Jewish country which saw the origins of the Christian mission. The Fourth Gospel is interested in the Samaritans precisely with respect to worship, with respect to their opposition to the temple. This is the meaning of the story of the Samaritan woman in Jn 4. The entire dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman concerns this question of worship. But we can go still further.

The radicalism of the Hellenists and their interest in the question of the temple is in no other writing of the New Testament so dominant as in the Fourth Gospel and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is in every respect closely related to the Johannine literature and must very probably be attributed to the same group. Of course the idea that the community is the true temple is also found in the Pauline writings (Christians as the temple of God in 1 Co 3<sup>16</sup>, 2 Co 6<sup>16</sup>, Eph 2<sup>21f.</sup>) and in 1 P 2<sup>5</sup> (the spiritual house). But in the Fourth Gospel, the idea that the temple is abolished, or rather replaced, is very much in the foreground and can be followed throughout the book. And, above all, it assumes the form in which we meet it exactly in the speech of Stephen; the Divine presence is not bound to the temple. Here is the point in which we see the relationship between the Johannine Gospel, nonconformist Judaism, and Stephen. There are many other grounds on which this could be argued. In this article we had to limit ourselves to this point which seems to me particularly important.

It is significant that the declaration of Jesus on the temple of Jerusalem is found precisely in the dialogue with the Samaritan woman, which serves the Evangelist as a framework for prophetic sayings concerning the mission in Samaria by the Hellenists, who were like the Samaritans opposed to the cult of the temple of Jerusalem. This fact confirms in a way that the interest of the Evangelist in the question of the temple is bound up precisely with the opposition of Stephen's group, the missionaries of Samaria, to the temple. It is true that for the author of the Fourth Gospel the positive aspect is much more important than the polemic. It must, however, be said that it is natural for the polemical aspect to be dominant in Stephen's speech, which is a plea in his defence. We simply do not know anything about the manner of Stephen's preaching apart from its polemical context. It is, however, probable that Stephen went further than the Fourth Gospel, in this sense that for Stephen the construction of the temple represented an infidelity already within the history of Israel, while for the Fourth Gospel it is doubtless

only after the coming of Christ that the cult of the temple was abolished.

Be this as it may, in the Fourth Gospel it is as always the positive, Christological aspect which predominates: *the Divine presence, which had until now been bound to the temple of Jerusalem, is from now on visible in the Person of Jesus Christ, in the Word made flesh.*

In the conversation with the Samaritan woman, it is true that Jesus Himself first expresses the negative side, in response to the question which she had asked as to who was right, the Samaritans who worshipped God on Mount Gerizim, or the Jews who worshipped Him in the temple of Jerusalem. Neither the one nor the other, was the answer of Jesus. The Divine presence is not bound to a place. The temple of Jerusalem is no better in this connexion than Mount Gerizim. This declaration is *absolutely in line with Stephen's speech* in Ac 7. It could even have been part of it. *It is in any case certain that this is exactly what the Hellenist missionaries who went to Samaria must have preached.* You reject the temple of Jerusalem, but God does not dwell on Mount Gerizim either. Stephen's entire speech is based on the theme that God is not bound to a place, nor even to a country, since Israel had received its revelations already outside the Holy Land.

And now the positive side of Jesus' answer to the Samaritan woman in the Fourth Gospel: 'you shall worship God in *spirit* and in truth'. In the first part of the dialogue it had been a question of the living water which Christ would give. Water in the Fourth Gospel (as in Qumran) is often a symbol of the Spirit, and there is certainly also a connexion with baptism. It is the Spirit in which the Divine presence is manifested. But we know that this Spirit is bound up with Christ. The Spirit, Christ, replaces from now on the place of worship. We recall that the speech of Stephen, after having mentioned the construction of the temple, concludes precisely with these words: 'you always resist the *Holy Spirit*!' The construction of the temple is an opposition to the Holy Spirit. So here in the Fourth Gospel worship is in *spirit*.

The Evangelist sees the idea, that Christ takes the place of the temple, realized *in the events of the life of Jesus*. This question of worship is one of his principal preoccupations. He tries to show through the life of the incarnate Jesus that from now on the question of worship must be asked differently since the coming of Jesus. Jesus Himself takes the place of the temple. God has revealed His presence in the life of the incarnate Jesus, and after the Resurrection He will continue to manifest His presence there, where Christ, raised to the right hand of God, is present. God present in the life of a man *ἐν*

*οαπκί*: this is what already the prologue said. The Divine glory, in Hebrew *shekinah*, previously limited to the temple is visible in Jesus Christ. Here is a saying just as blasphemous for Jewish ears as that which Stephen said. For every Jew the shekinah, the Divine glory, is limited to the temple. But from now on it is separated from the temple, because from now on it is bound to the Logos become flesh. We have seen *His glory* (the glory of God)—this is the idea which recurs throughout the Gospel and throughout the Johannine Epistles. God, whom no one can see, has become visible. His shekinah can be contemplated in Jesus. He has established His tabernacle among us, says the Johannine prologue: *ἐσκήνωσεν*. It is certain that the author, writing in Greek, chose this verb deliberately, because of the idea of the tabernacle, *σκήνη*, which as we have seen played such a great rôle in the polemic of the Hellenists. The tabernacle is legitimate, because it is not limited to any one place. It could be besides, as Schaeder has suggested, that he chose this word because the consonants of the Greek verb are the same as those of the Hebrew word *shekinah*.

At the end of the first chapter of the Gospel of John, in v. 51, we read that from now on heaven is opened, and that the bridge between heaven and earth is the Son of Man, on whom the angels ascend and descend. Here is a clear allusion to the dream of Jacob in Gn 28, which tells of the origin of the place of worship in Bethel. Again we find therefore this idea which is as dear to John as to the followers of Stephen, that the Divine presence is no longer limited to a locality, is also not limited to that stone of Bethel where Jacob had seen the ladder from heaven. It is here again a question of the place of worship. From now on heaven is always everywhere open, where Christ is. He, not the ladder, is the bridge, and it is on Him that the angels ascend and descend. In Christ there is a continual coming and going between heaven and earth. He replaces the place of worship.

Already the following chapter, Jn 2, speaks again of the temple—of its cleansing. This event surely happened at the end of the life of Jesus, where it is actually found in the Synoptic Gospels, for it explains in part the measures taken by the Jews, and especially the hate on the part of the high priest. It has, therefore, been asked why the Fourth Gospel puts this event at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. The answer is evident: in order to underline the importance which the idea of worship receives in this Gospel. That which the whole life of Jesus is meant to illustrate, that from now on worship is no longer limited to the temple, but to the Person of Christ, is manifested in a

particularly visible manner in this act of the cleansing of the temple. In driving out the dove sellers and the money-changers, Jesus really attacked the whole system of temple worship. For these sellers and changers were necessary for the correct functioning of the cult.

At the end of the story, the author interprets in his own way the word pronounced by Christ: destroy this temple, and I will raise it up again. He spoke of His own body, says the Evangelist, and he underlines that it was only after the resurrection of Christ that this understanding was evident to the disciples. We find, therefore, here again the idea that Christ crucified and resurrected takes the place of the temple. At the same time, the author doubtless knows that Jesus Himself, in speaking of the temple which He will rebuild and which is not made with human hands (Mk 14<sup>58</sup>), had in mind the community of disciples. Christ is there where the community is. Temple—Christ—community: these three are equivalent.

This interest in worship can be followed throughout the Fourth Gospel. In my study on the sacraments in the Fourth Gospel I tried to show that many of the Johannine narratives are meant to illustrate the idea that, since His resurrection, Christ is present in the Church, in baptism and Eucharist. We find here the idea, widely accepted among these nonconformist Jewish groups (Qumran!), that the sacrifices are replaced by baptism and the sacred meal, but in the Fourth Gospel, and here is what is new, baptism and Eucharist are bound up with the Person of Christ. In the last analysis then, it is still Christ who replaces the temple: before His death and resurrection, the Divine presence is manifested in His incarnation, afterwards in His sacraments.

Although I do not pretend that the author of the Johannine Apocalypse is identical with that of the Gospel and Epistles, I believe nevertheless that the author of the Apocalypse belonged to the same Johannine group. For the idea of the temple is present in the Apocalypse too, even in the culminating point where the author describes the vision of the heavenly Jerusalem (chs. 21–22): he sees no temple there, for the Almighty God is the temple and the Lamb. Here is exactly the idea of the Gospel.

We have now come to the end of our account. In choosing one example, opposition to the temple, we have seen how Johannine thought, without losing any of its originality, belongs completely to the spiritual realm which we have been studying. The affiliation which we set up, nonconformist Judaism—John the Baptist—the Hellenists of Acts—the Johannine group, has therefore been verified as to this special point. The Johannine group was recruited especially from the circle of John

the Baptist and is closely related to, if not identical with, the followers of Stephen called 'Hellenists'.

If this affiliation is correct, we understand better why we meet already in the New Testament two such different types of Christianity as the Synoptic and the Johannine. In this case it will no longer be possible to consider the Johannine type (to which must be added, besides the Johannine writings, the Epistle to the Hebrews), as a late, non-Palestinian product merely because it is further removed from the tendencies of official Judaism than the Synoptic type. If we understand better the type of Christianity which is closest to official Judaism, it is because the second type seems to have been relegated to the background after the persecution of Stephen, and on the other hand because the Pauline type, which is at once distinct from the Synoptic and the Hellenist types, tended to predominate.

We have not asked the question, to which of the two Jesus Himself belonged. This would demand a study by itself. He Himself was a member of the group of John the Baptist before beginning His ministry. One must admit that the group which the Book of Acts calls Hellenists existed already in the lifetime of Jesus, since it is a question of a Jewish group, and since it was present in the very first hour, at the moment of the constitution of the Jerusalem community. Jesus must have known them. We cannot discuss here the question of the relationship of Jesus with this group. Let us say that Jesus not only cleansed the temple, but He

also uttered words about the temple which played an important rôle in His trial. In the form—'I shall destroy this temple and I shall rebuild it'—it is a question of a false testimony, according to the Synoptists, which false witnesses, as Mark says, ascribed to Him. But it is certain that Jesus said something else: on the one hand (Mk 13<sup>2</sup>)—'there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down'; and on the other hand (Mk 14<sup>58</sup>)—'I will build another [temple] made without hands' (=the community of disciples). In Jn 2 these two affirmations are combined in the declaration which we read there in v. 19: 'destroy this temple, and I shall rebuild it'. That is, if this temple is destroyed, I shall rebuild it.

We cannot resolve the question whether Jesus is closer to the Synoptic or the Johannine type. For He is above these two groups, and we find Him consequently in both. Of course we cannot take the Fourth Gospel as our point of departure, for, from a literary point of view, it is certainly more recent than the Synoptic Gospels. But it would be good not to eliminate completely in a too unilateral fashion, as we are accustomed to do, the Johannine group, when it is a question of knowing the thought of Jesus. If the solution of the Johannine enigma is that which I have proposed to you, and which is suggested by the new discoveries, then this has consequences for our whole manner of understanding the origins of Christianity because we have to admit two types of Palestinian Christianity from the beginning, two types which are not opposed to each other, but which complete each other.

## Literature

### THE BIBLE

ANOTHER very useful translation of a German theological book has been made available under the English title *Ground Plan of the Bible* (Lutterworth Press; 27s. 6d. net). The author is Professor Otto Weber and the translator Dr. Harold Wright, who must be commended for the clarity and simplicity of his style. The book originally appeared in German as *Grundriss der Bibelkunde*. It is a general introduction to the study of the Bible suitable for theological students in the first year of their course. It is a comprehensive view of the contents of the Bible as a whole, and provides the background from which the student may proceed to more advanced study along more specialized lines.

The great advantage of the book is that it does not segregate into separate compartments the different disciplines of Biblical study. Sometimes

four different books have been needed to provide a critical introduction to the books of the Bible, an account of its history, an appreciation of its religion, and a presentation of it as the living Word of God to man in his present need. In this book all these four interests are adequately represented.

On the critical approach the author accepts the main conclusions of modern scholarship, where these have stood the test of prolonged scrutiny. But this does not prevent him from presenting the Bible as the Word of God. He writes: "'Holy Scripture' means a writing or a collection of writings on which God has laid His hand. Hence it is not that God is the theme of this book, but rather that God is the Lord of this book, and the men who here speak to us from thousands of years ago stand in the service of God." 'The Word of God is the self-disclosure of God.' 'It is not however the thoughts which man must conceive about God which stand in the foreground, but the

obedience which man renders to the call of God.' 'Christ, who is the Word of God, is the heart of the book, and also the criterion by which all must be measured.'

A book which aims to cover so large a theme within the compass of two hundred pages has of necessity to be selective, and some books in the Old Testament receive little attention. In the study of Matthew more than half the space is given to an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. But where the purpose is to serve as an appetizer rather than an encyclopædia this selectivity is not only permissible but desirable.

Idiosyncrasies of interpretation are studiously avoided, though the author does not shrink from taking his own line sometimes in defiance of current fashion. In reference to the Son of Man as a title of Jesus he writes: 'It is probably right to regard this as meaning "the man" in the sense of "true man", man as God wills him to be and as God in expressing His creator-will sends him at the end of days'. An existentialist point of view appears in his comment on 'demons': 'These hidden dangerous powers correspond to the abysses in the human psyche which have become terrifyingly plain to moderns in some cases of mental sickness'. 'We men have by no means a purely independent existence, but live within the sphere of influence of hidden powers.'

It is at first curious to find the pages of this book printed in double columns, and yet one has to confess that in some ways it makes for easier reading, since the pages are rather large, and some sections are printed in small type.

As a 'preliminary survey' of the ground later to be covered in more detail, this 'Ground Plan' will serve a very useful purpose and is to be warmly commended.

C. L. MITTON

#### THE IMMANUEL SECTION

The chapters of the Book of Isaiah which Professor Joh. Lindblom deals with in the book which he now presents—*A Study on the Immanuel Section in Isaiah* (Gleerup, Lund; Kr. 6)—have been studied critically and exegetically many times and their interpretative problems are well known. Writing from the standpoint of the traditio-historical school, he believes that the chapters contain a group of utterances which are not in historical order and which, in consequence, have to be examined individually.

Briefly stated, the author's thesis is that two phases in Isaiah's prophetic career are to be discerned in these chapters. In the first, which was related to the crisis in Jerusalem and Judah which was occasioned by the invasion of Pekah of

Israel and Rezin of Syria and is represented by 7<sup>3-17</sup> 8<sup>1-4</sup>, 9-10 9<sup>1-6</sup>, the prophet's message is one of hope and promise; the invasion danger will soon pass away and there will ensue a period of peace and prosperity conditioned by the birth into the community of a prince of the royal house of David (a prince identified with Hezekiah). Since the names given to this prince must be associated with his enthronement, Professor Lindblom has to make his enthronement at birth. But this line of interpretation involves him in certain serious difficulties; for example, he has to make this period of prosperity 'an intermezzo in the history of Judah, a postponement of the final judgment' and to admit that the new-born royal prince ushered in such an interim period, he has to make the presence of the boy Shear Yashub in the prophet's interview with Ahaz (7<sup>28</sup>) a symbol purely of hope when the very name speaks of hope *after* disaster, not *before* it, and he has to make the words 'since the day that Ephraim departed from Judah' mean 'since the prosperous days of king David' when obviously they could as easily mean 'since the disaster of the division of the united kingdom'.

But, it is maintained, 'not long after the birth of the prince the tone of Isaiah's preaching changed because of Ahaz's distrust and the people's infidelity (8<sup>5</sup>), although it is extremely difficult to find room for such an interval of time, since we can assume that Ahaz sought aid from Assyria when the invasion danger to Jerusalem and Judah was real and near, and not at a later juncture. But now, it is affirmed, Isaiah preached the doom of Judah, as well as of Ephraim and Syria, at the hands of Assyria (7<sup>18-25</sup> 8-58). That these passages should be so construed, will be generally admitted; but the author's interpretation of the significance of curds and honey in 7<sup>15</sup> as food of prosperity and abundance forces him now to regard the second use of these words in 7<sup>22</sup> as 'an alien element' within an oracle (7<sup>21-22</sup>) which has been transformed from one of doom to one of salvation.

This is a valuable and carefully worked out study and one which must receive attention; but it is doubtful if the author has contrived to deal convincingly with all the difficulties of these much-discussed chapters of Isaiah.

JOHN MAUCHLINE

#### SCIENCE AND RELIGION

One very important and interesting aspect of the present theological situation is the deep concern of many Christian writers to break down the old barriers which have separated religion and science, or more precisely, theologians and scientists

for a century. *The Spiritual Crisis of the Scientific Age*, by Mr. G. D. Yarnold (Allen and Unwin; 18s. net), is another in that movement, and like others with this concern, Mr. Yarnold refuses to interpret the relation of science to religion in terms of conflict. He prefers the word 'Crisis' to describe the testing of our whole spiritual being by the vast increase of human knowledge and technical skills.

The book, which consists of three lengthy essays, deals with the three levels at which this crisis occurs. First, there is the crisis of *understanding* created by the swift growth of our knowledge of the natural order. It is pointed out that there is great similarity in the attitude of science and theology to methodological procedure: both have to proceed 'existentially' on the basis of presuppositions which can not be 'proved'. After a detailed study of other scientific presuppositions concerning the nature of the external world held by modern scientists, and the nature of 'explanation', there follows the Christian description of the world as created and redeemed by God. In answer to the question: What must natural philosophy learn from theology? he suggests what will appear to some to be rather naïve counsel. The scientist, we are told, has to recognize that the 'discoveries' which he makes are part of God's revelation that the pattern of the natural world is the product of the mind of its Maker; and that through the study of Nature by the methods of science the human mind makes contact with the mind of the Creator.

The second form of our present spiritual crisis is the crisis of *belief*. Here the author deals with the relations of the kerygma to natural science. There is a very penetrating account of how Biblical criticism is a product of scientific interest, and of the place which the question of the nature of history still plays in Biblical studies. On the issues raised by Bultmann concerning historicity and mythology, Mr. Yarnold strongly affirms that 'objective occurrences of some kind form the basis of the proclamation' of the miracles and the Resurrection. The question of miracles is examined in the light of 'Christ's attitude to the supernormal', and the position is argued that we can not dismiss the supernatural element in the Gospels without questioning either our Lord's intelligence or His integrity.

The third form of the crisis is that of *living*—the crisis of the problems created for Christian ethics in a scientific age. The structure of Christian ethics is defined, on the one hand, by an analysis of the Christian doctrine of man, created in the image of God, fallen and redeemed through the self-offering of Christ; and on the other hand, by a delineation of the pattern which the life of Christ exhibited—respect for personality, implicit trust in

human nature, inner contentment, love (*agape*). The task of Christian ethics is not to reduce the technological problem of the twentieth century to the simple personal problems of the New Testament; it is, under the Spirit, to re-interpret the Christ-like quality of life to each generation. The work continues with a determined effort to bring under the light of the ethic of Jesus the major problems of our day—methods of mass-production; the techniques of specialization, material inequalities, automation, increased longevity, leucotomy and nuclear power. The last note of the book is one of hope—that the Church will strive more earnestly to challenge the world with the whole gospel of the grace of Jesus Christ, and that an eleventh hour repentance may save the world from final folly.

We shall all agree with the general intention of the book, and admire the well-informed mind which the author brings to much of the subject he has chosen, as well also as his manifest sincerity. The book could be well used as an introduction to the other more advanced books already published in this field.

JOHN MCINTYRE

#### DIVINE HEALING

Some people shy away from Divine Healing, others do it a disservice by a too uncritical enthusiasm. This symposium—*The Wonder of Divine Healing: A Divine Healing Symposium*, edited by the Rev. Dr. A. A. Jones (Arthur James; 12s. 6d. net)—is therefore doubly welcome for its editor and its contributors emphasize the fact that all healing is Divine, and that doctors, psychiatrists and ministers have each their part to play in bringing wholeness to men. Of the eleven contributors, three are medical practitioners, five are ordained men, one is qualified both as a doctor and as a minister, and one, Hugh Redwood, is a journalist. It is unfortunate that in the review copy sixteen pages, including the whole of Miss Graham Ikin's contribution, are missing.

The standard of contributions is uniformly high, though, for the present writer, no short statement of what 'Divine Healing' is, and of the problems raised by it, could be better than what we are given in Part 1 of this book—in 'The Church and Divine Healing' by the Bishop of Rochester, 'Divine Healing as the Doctor Sees It' by Dr. J. Burnett Rae, and 'Some Problems Raised by Divine Healing' by the Very Rev. H. C. Robins. A most original contribution follows from Dr. R. A. Lambourne emphasizing the need for avoiding a too individualistic approach, and seeing all sickness as communal in origin. His distinction between cases of healing which are

tactical successes and strategic failures (restoration of health but patient more selfish than before) and cases where the opposite is true (absence of physical healing but noticeable growth in spiritual quality) is well worth noting. A similar point is made by the Rev. Dr. J. M. Wilson.

Hugh Redwood's account of his own experience in the valley of the shadow is at once humbling and inspiring, and affords us a glimpse of what God can do when we place ourselves unreservedly in His hands. Other contributors also stress the need of committing oneself to God and leaving the issue with Him, and Dr. Alfred Torrie warns against what he calls 'the false goal of health' when sought as an end in itself.

The one-ness of body, mind and spirit is either stated explicitly or taken for granted by all contributors, and it is to be hoped that this book will find its way into the hands of doctors with too exclusively a materialistic approach to medicine, as well as into the hands of such ministers as may be inclined to over-simplify the situation and imagine that where the Church is active there is less need for the medical man. Nothing could be further from the truth. Doctors and ministers should work together far more than they do. Again and again we limit our achievements under God by working separately.

HAMISH McINTOSH

### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Bible is regaining its place in religious education. Two recent books seek to have it better used. The first—*The Bible and Christian Education*, by A. J. Ebbutt (Ryerson Press, Toronto)—shows some of the more obvious objections to a literal approach to the Bible and commends historical interpretation as the only sure foundation for Scripture teaching at all levels in the Church. The second, a more substantial and constructive book—*Scripture and the Word of God*, by the Rev. Raymond F. Cyster, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net)—is designed to help teachers in training to grasp the new theological emphasis in Bible study and to translate such understanding into individual lessons (of which some samples are given). The author states categorically 'There is only one solution to this situation of ineffective Bible teaching. The Bible must itself grip the teacher with a power which flows not only from knowledge about it but from seeing the point and feeling the point of what the Bible has to say to him and to her.' The thoughtful teacher will be instructed and challenged by this book.

The scholarly approach to the Bible in schools is encouraged by the place given to Scripture in the G.C.E. examinations. Two new text-books

have appeared in the London Divinity Series (James Clarke; 6s. net). *From the Death of Solomon to the Captivity of Judah: Book II. Old Testament*, by A. W. Heathcote, M.A., M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., is a marvel of clarity and compression, and it is perhaps asking too much that the introductory chapters should have included one on the nature of the Bible's 'history' books. *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ according to the Synoptic Gospels: Book IV. New Testament*, by Rev. E. Ridley Lewis, B.A., B.D., has a more manageable theme, and Mr. Lewis has arranged his material in chapters in a most helpful way for study, as, for example, making his concluding chapter 'The Nativity Stories'. Another school text-book on the Prophets—*Spokesmen of God*, by Mary E. Welsh, M.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 5s. net)—is intended for class reading by 13–14 year olds. There are good and varied suggestions for class activities but the attempt to simplify Gomer's story for the children is scarcely successful.

Religious education is, however, more than religious instruction. *Leading Elevens to Fourteens*, by Eileen A. H. Tresidder (Methodist Youth Department; 10s. 6d. net) shows just how varied religious education can be and is so practical that it deals with everything from understanding young people growing up to making a notice board for the Club wall. While most useful for Methodists, others can profit by its sound common sense. *The Years That Count*, by Miss Rosalind Rinker (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids; \$2.00), is described on the wrapper as 'A book that lets young people think for themselves', the young people apparently being those who are leaving school for work and college. But its young people seem to have a conservative religious background which few here possess, and it seems unsuitable for British students if it is right for their American counterparts. Such counselling, of which Miss Rinker has much experience, would be more effective face to face than on paper.

JOHN GRAY

### A SHORTER COMMENTARY ON ROMANS

Readers of Barth's 'Church Dogmatics' will find very little here—*A Shorter Commentary on Romans*, by Karl Barth (S.C.M.; 15s. net)—with which they are not already familiar; in fact the Commentary will serve as an excellent introduction to the larger work. Great themes are treated with a brevity we do not expect from Barth and frequent cross references to the Dogmatics make it easy to know where to turn for a fuller treatment. The approach is through and through theological and paragraphs are expounded rather than particular verses.

Considerable attention is properly devoted to the relation of the Christian gospel to the Old Testament, especially in the sections on Adam and Christ and election. In the latter it is interesting to note that Barth thinks Paul's knowledge of horticulture was not deficient; he deliberately chose a metaphor which was not in accord with normal practice in order to illustrate the miraculous nature of Divine grace. The treatment of redemption, justification and sanctification suffers somewhat from Barth's lack of interest in what actually takes place in the heart of the believer. It is good to say these have already taken place in Christ but the aim of Christian teaching and preaching is to lead to the transformation of human lives. Barth's persistent refusal to speak of experience and his disparagement of psychology leave a hiatus here. A similar sense of lack is evident in chs. 7 and 8. Barth's assertion that we have been called away from sin, and that, in faith the world of sin is behind us, should lead to something like Wesley's doctrine of perfect love, but that appears to be far from Barth's thoughts. He does not appear to have much understanding of the cultivation of the spiritual life.

It is good, however, to have this concentrated exposition of the Epistle which more than any other has shaped Barth's own theology and in which, as he says, there is always something new to learn.

PERCY SCOTT

### THE PROBLEM OF CAUSALITY

Although many modern Muslims would indignantly deny that Islam teaches fatalism and would be able to quote the Koran to prove their contention, the prevailing doctrine as it developed in the early centuries showed a fatalistic tendency. This was a natural development owing to the emphasis laid upon God's omnipotence. As a result He was looked on as the sole Agent, which rendered any causality on the part of a secondary agent superfluous. Thus everything which happened was attributed to God's creative activity. For example, one should not say that fire causes combustion; all one is entitled to say is that the combustion occurs along with it, for God and not fire is the cause of combustion. In *Islamic Occasionalism* (Allen and Unwin; 21s. net) Dr. Majid Fakhry has discussed the Islamic metaphysics of atoms and accidents and the repudiation of causality by al-Ghazālī. He has then dealt at greater length with the Averroist rehabilitation of causality, and has devoted his longest chapter to the causal dilemma and the Thomist synthesis. In a concluding section he states that his purpose has been 'to defend the validity of causality

against the sceptical claims of theistic occasionalism'. An inert ontological order is one which is lifeless and barren, and so is 'unworthy of the perfection and generosity of its Sovereign Author'. He argues that the roots of causality are to be found in being which utters itself in dynamic activity, communicating its substantial perfection by virtue of its munificent character and revealing its nature by virtue of its inner luminosity. The clue to this twofold self-revelatory character of being is discovered in the Dionysian conception of Being as Good and the Aristotelian conception of Being as Act, which two conceptions 'had to be integrated into a synthetic conception of being in its relation to causality—a task successfully achieved by Aquinas'. The whole discussion displays a wide range of scholarship, for the author is equally at home with the Arabic and European sources. Each chapter is provided with numerous notes and references, and there is an excellent bibliography, to which should be added the English translation of Averroes' *Tahāfut al-tahāfut* by S. Van den Berg (2 vols. [Luzac, 1954]).

JAMES ROBSON

### UNITY OF THE CHURCH

Assuming that conversations between Anglicans and Presbyterians are to continue and are to take up the deep theological issues which have been too much neglected hitherto, we cordially commend to the participating representatives and to all who are concerned in the outcome a recent volume, *Corpus Christi*, by the Rev. Professor Geddes MacGregor (Macmillan; 30s. net).

In this study of the Church according to the Reformed Tradition Dr. MacGregor has no difficulty in showing that that tradition, besides insisting on Word, Sacraments and Discipline, presupposes both the continuity and the essential unity of the Church. He finds not only that the essential and only ground of the unity of the Church must be Christ Himself but also that the real principle of continuity must be Christ Himself. This has an important bearing on the Reformed view of the ministry and apostolic succession. These and other important issues are discussed with scholarly care and moderation. We quote one sentence of topical interest. 'This means that while the ministry is the divinely bestowed episcopate, its organization is a matter of human ordering in the sense that it has only the duty to organize itself as efficiently as possible for its ministration. In the fulfilment of this moral duty it will arrange itself, now in one way, now in another. There is no reason, on this view, why even in the visibly integrated Church that is the ecumenical hope, there should not be a

variety of forms of ecclesiastical government.' The value of the book is enhanced by an extensive bibliography and by appendices setting forth the teaching of Augustine and of the main Protestant confessional documents on the Church.

STEWART MECHIE

The idea of 'the responsible society' has taken a central place in the social ethics of the ecumenical movement. There is a danger, however, that it may become merely a slogan unless thought is given to its bearing on the institutions of mankind. One sees great usefulness therefore in *Foundations of the Responsible Society*, by Professor Walter G. Muelder of the Chair of Social Ethics in Boston University School of Theology (Abingdon Press; \$6.00).

This comprehensive survey shows the relevance of the principle of social responsibility to the State, law, economic life, work, management, agricultural policy, the Welfare State and other spheres. It is a large volume with fourteen pages of index and nine pages of closely printed bibliography. The author, who likes to work at the points of intersection of several disciplines—theological, philosophical and social, has had contact with the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey and is concerned to point out problems which require further study as well as to advance tentative conclusions. Thus it is a book for the researcher and student as much as for the serious general reader.

*The Concept of Morality*, by Mrs. Pratima Bowes (Allen and Unwin; 25s. net), is an exceedingly careful analysis of the validity and value of ethical study. The writer has little use for doctrines which would minimize the importance of ethical investigation and is inclined to take a very objective view. Ethics is held to be much more than mere custom or a study of linguistics, and ethical endeavour is fundamentally a practical assertion of human freedom and a claim to the recurrent possibility of new beginnings however strong the pressure of heredity and environment may be. Psycho-analysis has, it is thought, over-reached itself, and arrived almost at a cancellation of human endowments. Ethics cannot be based on mere feeling or on reasoning pure and simple; there is always an intuitive element in ethical valuation, but the right to logical reflection and discussion must never be withheld.

The book is characterized by a common-sense attitude and an avoidance of extremes. In certain respects it is severe but never priggish. The author's divergence from the doctrine of the greatest good of the greatest number is well brought out, it being suggested that this tends to lump people together and to weaken the idea of

personality. The distinction between 'right' and 'duty' is shown to be useful in emphasizing a particular kind of value both in individual behaviour and social relations. The book ends with a most sympathetic treatment of the connexion between moral praise and moral blame, and appeals for the exercise of charity where this is possible without condemnation of what is obviously undesirable in morals and a dangerous approach to determinism or modernistic liberalism.

The style of writing is not particularly simple, and too often repetition of reading is necessary if intelligibility is to be reached; but many readers will envy the writer's ability to use effectively a language which is not her original medium of communication.

*Adolphus Tompkinson* is the title of a book of children's addresses written by Mr. Paul Morton-George and published by the Epworth Press (5s. net). 'Adolphus Tompkinson bears this rather outrageous name solely in order that no small boy should ever think I was talking about him', Mr. Morton-George tells us in his Preface. Mr. Morton-George can talk to children as you will see if you turn to the 'Virginibus Puerisque' section this month, where we quote the first talk. In this volume there are twenty-one first-rate addresses.

*Isaiah 40-66*, by the Rev. S. Clive Thexton, M.Th., is the fifth volume in the series of the 'Epworth Preacher's Commentaries' (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net). The commentaries are written specifically for preachers, and particularly for local preachers who have neither the time nor the scholarship to tackle the more 'critical' type of commentary. (This is not to say that they are 'fundamentalist'.) It is assumed that readers of these commentaries must, as a rule, be content with only one commentary on any single book of the Bible; consequently only two books are recommended 'for further study'. That both are fifty years old is no matter; more might have been done in the meantime to help the class of reader for whom this series is intended. Naturally, the Christian preacher will read the Old Testament in the light of the New, but that is not quite the same thing as reading the New Testament into the Old. Mr. Thexton has carried out a by no means easy task with clarity and restraint. A valuable feature of his commentary is an index of New Testament passages, 'in the hope that it may prove of some use to the preacher when he takes one or other of them for his text'.

We are glad to draw attention to *Barriers to Unity*, edited by the Rev. Michael Bruce and published by the Faith Press at 15s. net. In

the form of a symposium, it represents the views of the International League for Apostolic Faith and Order and it is designed to help in building a bridge across the Catholic-Protestant chasm from the Catholic side. Since Rome stands aloof from the ecumenical movement and since political barriers make difficult much participation by the Orthodox, the World Council of Churches has a bias in a Protestant direction. This is an effort to redress the balance by helping Protestants to understand the Catholic position. There is no attempt here to find forms of words acceptable to people who mean different things. There is rather frank treatment of Protestant difficulties in the course of which it appears that a fresh and more hopeful discussion of eucharistic theology should now be possible between the two sides. This is a book valuable out of proportion to its size.

We offer a welcome to *A History of the S.P.C.K.*, by Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke (S.P.C.K.; 2rs. net). The author tells us that he decided 'to write a popular book of moderate length'. No one is better qualified to do so than he, for he was Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K. for twenty-eight years, used to look at the archives in the strong room during his lunch hour and, after being invited to write the Society's history, spent five years in reading all the documents systematically. The result is what those who are acquainted with the author's other works would expect—a readable narrative with the main aspects and lines of development illumined and not obscured by much interesting detail. There are five appendices, including a brief but useful one on the S.P.C.K. in Ireland and Scotland. We note a misprint in a date on p. 221.

The title, *Not Angels but Anglicans*, may suggest a book that is cleverly superficial. It is, in fact, not superficial, but is based on sound knowledge, presented in a clear and interesting fashion. The author, the Rev. D. L. Edwards, may be described as a middle of the road Anglican. He has tried to appreciate the best in all types of churchmen, and he has contrived to present a candid yet not unhopeful account of the Church of England and its tasks to-day, set in the context of the ecumenical movement. Published at 8s. 6d. net by the S.C.M. Press, it is a book for non-Anglicans as much as for Anglicans.

Wilberforce's *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes in this Country Contrasted with Real Christianity*, now published in 'A Treasury of Christian Books' (S.C.M.; 9s. 6d.

net), was first published in 1797, when it immediately became and remained for half a century a religious best-seller. In it the honoured anti-slavery leader gives copious and facile generalizations on the difference between a nominal and formal profession of Christianity and genuine evangelical piety. The book contains sound if obvious Christian sense, but it is puzzling how to explain its original enormous circulation and how to commend it to modern readers.

The St. Giles' Lectures delivered in Edinburgh during Holy Week, 1958, by Dr. Olive Wyon have been published by the S.C.M. at 3s. 6d. net, under the title *The Grace of the Passion*. The thought which runs through these meditations is the infinite grace of God, and it is considered under five aspects—the Grace of Prayer, of Suffering, of Silence, of Love and of Victory. The quotations prefixed and the prayers appended to the several meditations show the width of the distinguished lecturer's devotional reading and, like the meditations themselves, are moving and helpful.

*Marriage and Celibacy*, by Mr. Max Thurian (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), is the latest addition to the series of 'Studies in Ministry and Worship'. It is an English edition of a book published in Switzerland four years ago. The author is a member of the Community of Taizé, which, says the Rev. T. Ralph Morton in a Foreword, is composed of men who have accepted the full life of a religious community with pledges of poverty, celibacy and obedience. They go out to work in parishes and in industrial missions, but they return to Taizé which is their only home—an interesting development in the tradition of the Reformed Church. The book before us is a study of the teaching of the New Testament and of the Church on marriage and on celibacy. The former has been much considered by the Reformed Church in relation to divorce. Perhaps this is a timely reminder that Christian celibacy as a vocation is as genuinely grounded as Christian marriage.

*The People of God*, by Professor Donald G. Miller of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), is a straightforward and lucid exposition, based throughout on Scripture, of the connexion of the Church with the Old Testament people of God and of the relation of the Church to its Lord. Later chapters deal with the faith and worship of the Church, its unity and its mission in the world. This should prove an admirable text-book on the Church, whether for teaching or for individual or group study.

# Religious Education

## Teaching an Epistle—I Corinthians

BY MARGARET AVERY, O.B.E., B.A., S.TH., LONDON

IN a previous article we considered on broad lines the place of the Epistles in the Scripture syllabus. We now turn to the consideration of a single epistle—I Corinthians, a study which must involve some reference also to Acts and 2 Corinthians.

What is the best age to study this Letter? Some incidental reference is appropriate in the middle school, to supplement a course on Acts. For example, the stresses experienced by Paul at Corinth can be illustrated by his rebuke to the cliques in the Church (1<sup>10-16</sup>) or by his insistence on unity (1 Co 12), on love (1 Co 13) or on orderly worship (1 Co 14). There are many points in the Scripture course in which reference must be made to the vital passage at the beginning of ch. 15, where we have the earliest list of Resurrection appearances in the New Testament. If 1 Co 13 is learned by heart, it needs to be carefully introduced to show why it was written and the use Paul makes of the local setting—a point that will be considered later.

The time for a close and detailed study is the Fifth or Sixth Form stage or, of course, with students. Whether one is dealing with school-girls or students, the teacher's primary aim must be to bring the Letter to life. St. Paul and the Corinthians must be *real* people, facing the implications of Christianity in a pagan environment not unlike our own, and the issues at stake must be seen to be relevant to the situation to-day. Scholarly study is quite compatible with drawing out of the Letter a challenge and an inspiration for Christian living in the modern world.

If the Letter is to come alive, our pupils need to know something of the background of life in Corinth. An intelligent Sixth Form in a school where the curriculum has not been narrowed down too early will have some knowledge of the Greco-Roman world of the first century and pupils who have specialized in classics and studied Roman history will know still more. In other cases the teacher will do well to assume that he must provide the background himself. A glance at the map will show why Corinth was the fourth largest city in the Roman Empire. Tucked into the western side of the Gulf of Corinth, with its port of Cenchraea on the eastern side, facing two ways—to Italy and to Asia Minor—it was a great cosmo-

politan market, the meeting place of East and West. Ships could put in on one side or the other and send their goods by land across the narrow isthmus to avoid the tricky southern coast of Achaia. Like great seaports in every age, it saw the intermingling of many races and cultures and attracted to itself not only their wealth but their vices. Immorality was rife and the lovely temple of Aphrodite was the home of several hundred prostitutes who flaunted their charms in the harbour and the busy streets. Decent women walked abroad veiled and were veiled in mixed public assemblies. Paul found rabbinical reasons for telling the women of Corinth to cover their heads in church but it was sound common sense. It is not surprising that Paul is insistent on moral purity and the high ideal of marriage that was part of his Jewish heritage. He has to rebuke the Corinthians for gross immorality such as even the lax contemporary world would condemn (5<sup>1</sup>).

What is left of Corinth shows how splendid were its public buildings and how varied its public life. It was the centre of government for Achaia. The proconsul's residence and hall of judgment, temples and fine monuments graced the forum. On the isthmus was the huge stadium where the Isthmian Games were held, when competitors and spectators from far and wide filled the hotels of the city to overflowing and in private houses or taverns late revellers caroused to the accompaniment of music and dancing. (Pupils with a taste for literature might discover what Keats has to say about this in *Lamia*.) And the setting for this activity was great natural beauty. Beneath a dominating peak the city descended in terraces to the sea, its fountains tempering the Mediterranean heat and its flowering shrubs and gardens giving shade and colour.

The city was also famous for its artistic achievements, particularly for its metal work. The bronze gates of the Temple, known as the Beautiful Gate (Ac 3<sup>2</sup>), were made in Corinth; so were copper mirrors and musical instruments (see 1 Co 13<sup>1, 12</sup>) as well as vases and statuettes. A small hand mirror of polished copper, of exactly the shape we use to-day, came to light when a bomb fell during the Great War on a Roman house eight feet below the modern street level in Butchery Lane, near

Canterbury Cathedral. The mirror might have been made by a Corinthian craftsman of Paul's day. Background information is not an end in itself but it can bring the setting of the Letter to life and make some obscure points clear.

At some point the Letter should be read through as a whole in a modern translation, quickly, without attempting complete elucidation, and in a version which conveys the vigorous colloquial idiom of Paul's Greek better than the stately periods of the Authorized Version. J. B. Phillips' *Letters to Young Churches* or Dr. Wand's *New Testament Letters* provide such a translation. Bondage to the habit of reading in verses may make this seem to some pupils a heavy task, but it is essential. Both the modern versions I have mentioned are well printed and easy to read.

This quick reading should give the pupil a general idea of what was wrong at Corinth and what measures Paul took to set it right. It should arouse questions to which either the teacher or the introduction in a good commentary can provide the answers. I believe that it is good to let the pupil first discover what he can for himself. His queries cannot be answered without reference to Ac 18<sup>1-11</sup> and 2 Corinthians. In Acts we see that the Church at Corinth grew from the synagogue but with such bitter opposition that such Jews and 'God-fearers' (Gentiles attracted to Judaism) as accepted the new faith had to follow Paul into a Roman house next door to the synagogue where they could worship in quiet. Here is a good example of the little 'house churches' in which Christians worshipped unobtrusively until the Edict of Constantine, two centuries and a half later, made them free to build in the open distinctive places of worship. Pupils might be interested to know that in San Clemente, in modern Rome, there is a twelfth century church containing choir stalls of the fourth or fifth century taken from the earlier Christian church which lies below it, and below the early basilica is the house or 'palazzo' of Clement of Rome. In one of the rooms of this spreading house Christians met for worship till Clement was martyred and their prayers are written on the walls. So in the atrium of the house of Crispus did Christians meet in Corinth.

Attention can also be drawn to Paul's danger in Corinth and to his shrinking from the opposition and danger he had to face (Ac 18<sup>9, 10</sup>). Only under a strong sense of compulsion was he able to fulfil his task. The Jewish plot to use the inexperience of a new Governor to trap Paul failed completely. Gallio looked milder than he was. A contemporary describes him as 'dulcis Gallio'. Our own race has also produced rulers that were cultured and humane as well as just.

Second Corinthians throws light on the Cor-

inthian correspondence as a whole. If, as seems probable, there were four Letters of which our Letter was the second, the third Letter (2 Co 10-13) shows how desperate was the situation at Corinth and with what pain and passion and irony Paul sought to retain his authority and save them from disloyalty to Christ (see especially 2 Co 11<sup>23-28</sup>). In studying Paul's character 2 Corinthians is important, as it shows his vehemence, his sensitiveness, his uncalculating devotion and his sufferings.

Then follows a detailed study of the text, on the basis of *themes*, for example, disunity in the Church, Christian social life in a pagan environment, Christian worship, the Resurrection, and so forth. An outline of the Letter, giving chapter and verse is necessary whether provided by the teacher or made by the pupil for himself. This gives the student guidance so that he can pay special attention to sections which interest him. Also pupils can read up beforehand the theme that is to be discussed in a particular lesson. It is unnecessary and often impossible for the teacher to read with the class every word of the text but the main issues should be clear and the pupil encouraged to explore.

In a Sixth Form course I have used the seminar method which is convenient with a small group. Each pupil or group of pupils prepared a paper on a particular theme. Discussion followed reading of the paper and it was in this discussion that the *relevance* of the Letter to modern life became clear. Such questions as these are likely to arise: Why are modern Christians so divided? Do these divisions hinder the spread of Christianity? Can we do anything for the cause of unity? How should a Christian behave who lives in a non-Christian family? Should Christians use set forms of public worship? What is the meaning of Holy Communion? What does Paul mean by love? How can we be sure that Jesus rose from the dead? What difference does the Resurrection make to me? What do we mean when we call Paul a 'saint'? Why did he prefer celibacy to marriage? What has the Christian Church to say about the relations between men and women?

When papers have been carefully prepared, it is convenient to preserve them in a file so that the whole group can have access to the individual's research.

It is important that discussion should be frank and honest and that it should lead to fuller knowledge and deeper spiritual understanding, even if it is sometimes inconclusive.

Study of 1 Corinthians will not have been in vain if those who have undertaken it have really come face to face with St. Paul and through the life and teaching of the Apostle have caught a glimpse of his Master.

## Contributions and Comments

### Who Were the Liberals?

IN an interesting article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for August, 1959, Dr. Glasson seeks to define the word 'liberal' in its theological sense, and to show that during the so-called period of liberal ascendancy there were—apart from the rather superficial R. J. Campbell and a few others—no outstanding liberal theologians in Britain. He does this, however, by using too narrow a definition of 'liberal' and by omitting from consideration many of the really important theological figures of the period in question.

Surely there are degrees of liberality, though Dr. Glasson tends to equate Liberalism with heresy, and takes Harnack as the type. It is of course true that Harnack had few disciples in this country—even Campbell got his ideas not from Harnack but from the British idealists. Dr. Glasson, however, thinks of Liberalism in another way. It is said to be the kind of theology which Barth has attacked. Now this suggests rather wider criteria. A liberal would be, *inter alia*, one who admits reason alongside revelation in theology; who recognizes natural theology as complementary to revealed theology; who acknowledges that there are truths about God to be found in philosophy and the non-Christian religions. Liberalism would thus be a method of approaching theology rather than a body of doctrine. The liberal method *could* lead to fairly orthodox results—indeed, some of the scholars whom I shall mention in a moment were substantially orthodox, one of them sufficiently so to be appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.

What, then, are we to say of J. R. Illingworth, who says that revealed religion is a superstructure erected on the basis of natural religion, and that the polemical attitude to the non-Christian religions is quite untenable? (*Personality Human and Divine*, 161–162). Or of Hastings Rashdall, whose 'liberal' view of the Atonement so irritated James Denney? Or of Dean Inge, who says of Plotinus (surely rather an odd remark for a Christian!) 'I have lived with him for nearly thirty years, and have not sought him in vain, in prosperity or adversity' (quoted by Rudolf Metz, *A Hundred Years of British Philosophy*, 785). Or of William Temple who, in one short shattering paragraph of his Gifford Lectures pronounces as sane a judg-

ment on Barth as can be found? (*Nature, Man and God*, 396). Space permits me to do no more than mention the names of such eminent men as Clement Webb, Burnham Streeter, F. R. Tennant, C. E. Raven. Were such men as I have mentioned the liberals of British Theology? If they are not, then we are merely disputing about the use of a word. If they were, then I would say that they were our best theologians of recent times—and may we be delivered from any new conservatism which disparages them!

JOHN MACQUARRIE

Glasgow

### Syria and Cilicia—A Note

IN Gal 1<sup>21</sup> we read that St. Paul, after his first visit to Jerusalem subsequent to his conversion, came to the regions of Syria and Cilicia. The account in Ac 9<sup>30</sup> suggests that he went direct from the port of Cæsarea to Tarsus.<sup>1</sup> Commentators have, therefore, had to assume either that he did not go direct to Tarsus but visited Syria on the way, or that he made a journey to Syria after his arrival from Jerusalem; in which case he must have gone back to Tarsus before Barnabas came to find him.

However, the phrase *ta klímata tēs Syrias kai tēs Kilikias* would appear to justify another possibility, namely, that one district and not two are under consideration. This possibility is strengthened if we recall that at the time when Galatians was written Cilicia was not under separate provincial

<sup>1</sup> That Paul went by sea and not by land to Tarsus is agreed by modern commentators (see *The Beginnings of Christianity*, iv. 106; F. F. Bruce *The Acts of the Apostles*, 207; Knowing in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ad. loc., etc.) Had he intended to go by land, a visit to Cæsarea would have been out of his way; and if an escort was necessary at all, why should it have left Paul at Cæsarea if he had the whole of the rest of Palestine to traverse on foot? Due attention should be paid to ἐξαπέστειλαν, a word hardly suitable for a land journey. Moreover κατὰγειν in the active is almost a technical term of 'to bring down to the sea' just as the passive is the regular phrase for 'to land'. Luke avails himself constantly of this nautical use of the word (27<sup>3</sup> 28<sup>12</sup> 21<sup>3</sup> and Lk 5<sup>11</sup>).

administration. There is no evidence whatever for the existence under the Early Empire of a separate province of Cilicia. The wild tract west of the Taurus, known as Cilicia Tracheia was too primitive to be easily Romanized, and so Augustus allowed the indigenous Teucrid House to control part of it; part was ceded to Amyntas, King of Galatia, and was administered by the Roman province of Galatia when it was formed after his death in 25 B.C. The rest of Tracheia was assigned as a client-kingdom to Archelaus of Cappadocia, and later to Antiochus IV. of Commagene until A.D. 72. In that year,<sup>1</sup> Vespasian combined the whole of Tracheia with the fertile eastern district known as Cilicia Pedias into the single independent province of Cilicia. Before then the sixteen city states, with Tarsus at their head, that went to make up Cilicia Pedias, had been administered by the governor of Syria. Indeed, the full title of that province was Syria-Cilicia-Phœnice. Thus it would be natural, and correct, to couple together Syria and Cilicia as a single unit in ordinary speech. They were bound by the closest historical, cultural and geographical as well as political ties.<sup>2</sup>

Bearing this in mind, it is interesting to note that in Gal 1<sup>21</sup>, N\*, 33, 1611 and a few other MSS. omit the second article, and read *ta klimata tēs Syrias kai Kilikias*, the one article throwing into the closest association the two substantives to which it refers. And in the two places in Acts where the provinces are mentioned together, 15<sup>23</sup> and 15<sup>41</sup>, precisely the same thing has happened. The absence of the second article in 15<sup>41</sup> which would have served to designate Cilicia as a separate province, has seemed strange to the scribes of B, D, etc., for in their day, of course, Syria and Cilicia were quite distinct.

Thus both Luke and Paul are writing with meticulous accuracy when they speak of *hē Syria kai Kilikia*, Syro-Cilicia. It represents perfectly the situation before A.D. 72, when Vespasian, who had spent many years of hard service in the East, and was well acquainted with the needs of the situation there, decided to combine the two parts of Cilicia into a single province.

Does this shed any light on the date of the com-

position of Acts?<sup>3</sup> Is it a straw in the wind that suggests a date before A.D. 70? Or are we to suppose that Luke was consciously archaizing?

E. M. B. GREEN

Eastbourne

## Was our Lord an Only Child?—Luke ii. 43-46

LIGHT is thrown on the controversy about whether Mary and Joseph had other children, after the birth of Jesus, by observing the behaviour of parents, especially away from home. There is a marked difference between the attitude of parents of an only child and that of those with a large family. Even where the parents of an only child are too sensible to 'fuss' over him or her, they seem always to be aware of where he or she is. Their eyes follow the child if in the same room and their plans always take account of his existence. Quite otherwise is it where there is a large family. Concern for the younger children has wiped out the constant watchfulness over the first. Unless he asks for something or intrudes his disobedience he is left largely to look after himself—at least by the age of twelve. Possibly simply because he has had to shift for himself, the oldest of a large family tends to be more responsible and self-reliant.

It is simply unthinkable that Mary and Joseph could have left behind their twelve-year-old only Child in a city at a festival time and not worried about Him for a whole day. It is more than possible that they might have left their twelve-year-old oldest Child, if they were burdened by the care of several younger children.

So despite some of the Fathers, and without putting undue weight on such passages as Mt 12<sup>46</sup> 13<sup>56</sup> and Gal 1<sup>19</sup> there seems little doubt that our Lord had brothers and sisters after the flesh.

JOHN R. GRAY

Glasgow

<sup>1</sup> Suet., *Vespasian*, 8.

<sup>2</sup> For the complicated history of changes in Cilicia see C.A.H., ii. 139, 602, 616, A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Provinces*, ch. 8; G. A. Haver, *Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria* [Princeton, 1915]; Ramsay's article 'Cilicia' in *H.D.B.* and authorities quoted there; also Strabo, 533-51, 666-76.

<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, does it perhaps throw any light on the much-disputed *tēn Phrygian kai Galatikēn chōran* of Ac 16<sup>6</sup> and 18<sup>23</sup>? Ramsay's view that these words refer to an otherwise unknown region, *chōra*, of Galatic Phrygia might possibly be strengthened by this admittedly partial parallel.

## Relevance

BY THE REVEREND CANON E. MOORE DARLING, COVENTRY

In a broadcast sermon recently the preacher used the word 'relevance' fifteen times. It was sad that one was hypnotized into counting instead of listening, but even sadder that a preacher, on the air too, was hypnotized by a word and that word one of which many of his listeners were unlikely to know the full and precise meaning. Saddest of all was the fact that there is no word of more power in our religious vocabulary to-day than the word *relevance*!

It seems to me that a prime necessity is that the great Christian truths should be expressed in terms which relate them to living as it is to-day, using the vocabulary and intellectual idiom of the twentieth century, and not of the fourth or even the sixteenth. The gospel we know is unchanging, but it must be expressed in terms which make it clear to the present generation. That is what I am convinced we are failing to do. Neither in services nor sermons, and least of all in our hymns, are our efforts relevant. Far too often we use phrases and symbols which are meaningless even to the intelligent listener to-day.

First look at our choice of readings from Holy Writ. In doing so I will confine myself to my own Church and to the very centre of its worship, *i.e.* the Blessed Sacrament. Thus the Epistle for Holy Innocents Day is Rev 14, for the Circumcision Ro 4<sup>8</sup>. The Epistle for Lent Four is Gal 4<sup>21</sup> and the following Sunday He 9<sup>11</sup>, while on Trinity Sunday Rev 4 is chosen. Very humbly and reverently I plead that all these readings pass right over the head of the common man—and between Trinity Sunday and Advent the list given could be extended. What goes over the head of the common man is irrelevant to his condition and here is a mass of such irrelevancy right at the heart of our worship.

If you ask 'What *do* you want?' I answer 'They need Epistles like 1 Co 9<sup>24</sup> and 1 Co 13, set for two of the pre-Lent Sundays, and acutely relevant to-day.' By far the worst example of how completely out of touch with modern man is a great deal of our worship is surely to be found in the case of the hymns we sing—and remember that hymns represent in very many cases the layman's main contribution to an act of worship. Why should he be called on to use phrases and symbols which are in some cases meaningless and in others repugnant to him?

First on the list I would put hymns which relate Christianity to blood sacrifice. Of course to the theologian the connexion is clear, as it was obvious

to St. Paul who had been brought up in a faith founded on blood sacrifices, but the average worshipper to-day entirely lacks such a background. During a fascinating spell as Chaplain of a famous Public School I discovered how deeply adolescents resented what were classified by them as 'Precious Blood Hymns'. I beg of you not to be shocked. I am stating a plain fact. How *can* a normal man pray that His Blood shall 'fall gently on me drop by drop', or sing such morbid nonsense as 'There is a fountain filled with blood drawn from Immanuel's veins'? Of how many of us is it true that 'With what rapture gaze we on those glorious scars' and even in the odd case where it is true, are we not in a morbid and unhealthy frame of mind?

Coming from the hymns which give a distorted view of the Passion of our Lord to those using symbols and phraseology which are meaningless, what passes through the mind of the common man when he is exhorted to 'extol the stem of Jesse's rod'? What sense can he make of the heavenly host 'casting down their golden crowns around the glassy sea'? How can anyone not soaked in the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination get even an idea of the meaning of 'Rock of Ages cleft for me'? Surely, too, we reach the apotheosis of banality when we beg our Father to 'Let some droppings fall on me'!

I shall, of course, be told that 'people love these hymns'. One in ten of the people of this country go to church. Of that ten per cent a number of good elderly folk do love them but most of the ninety per cent outside *don't*, and many of the age group 18-45 inside are unmoved by them. A cynic would add that people will sing anything to a nice juicy tune played slowly!

In our preaching and writing I suggest that we use far too many phrases which, however pregnant of meaning to us, are empty of significance to those who do not share our religious background. Remember that to-day they number at least ninety per cent of our population. To that ninety per cent words like conversion and salvation either mean nothing or (what I think is far worse) convey an utterly false impression or a dangerous half truth. Again when I say I believe in the Incarnate Christ I know exactly what I mean, but does the average listener? The Atonement is another technical expression which means nothing until I first point out that it stands for at-one-ment with God, and then go on to work out how such an

at-one-ment is achieved, and what it accomplishes. As did the Apostles we teach the fact of the Resurrection, but how often do we make it clear why the Resurrection *matters*? In the same context we invite our folk to proclaim their belief in the resurrection of the body. How many of us are aware how serious a stumbling-block to the common man to-day is 'of the body', forgetting that two thousand years ago St. Paul was acutely aware of the stumbling-block and took immense pains to clear the minds of the Corinthians in regard to it.

Summarizing this section, the root trouble is that we again and again assume that our listeners share our religious background, understand our technical terminology, are acquainted with our religious shorthand, when such is far from being the case.

If only we would go back to the Gospels it would

be plain to us how very different was the approach of our Master. The parables are unique in their relevance to the life of the common man in His day. The discourses, profound and beyond anything else in religious literature, are free from any taint of cliché or catch phrase. His interviews with say, Simon the Pharisee, Nicodemus, and the woman of Samaria, are a model of the way to get alongside folk—maybe *the* one lesson of His we most need to learn. 'The sheep look up and are not fed.' Bluntly put, they don't fancy the food we offer them because of its staleness—indeed much of it has been growing stale since the sixteenth century! Surely the call is to present the Jesus of the Gospels in words as simple and as contemporary as those He used in His day. It is a fact of experience that when we do so present Him the common people hear it gladly.

## In the Study

### Virginibus Puerisque

#### An African Story

BY THE REVEREND RONALD SANGSTER,  
MIDDLESBROUGH

'Who is the image of the invisible God.'—Col 1<sup>15</sup>.

A FRIEND of mine, a missionary in Africa, says that the native people of his church are great story-tellers; and occasionally, if you ask him nicely, he will share with you one of their favourite yarns.

One such story tells of an old lady who had heard about the Great Spirit who lives in the sky, and it occurred to her that any one who climbed up high enough might manage to catch a glimpse of God. She took a very large cooking-pot, turned it upside down, climbed upon it and stood and stared into the sky until her neck began to ache; but there was no sign at all of God.

Presently an inquisitive boy came along to see what she was doing, and to keep him from becoming a nuisance she sent him around the village to collect more pots. If only she could make a tall stack of cooking-pots, she would be certain to climb up high enough to see what God was like. In no time at all the boy returned with more. One by one he passed them up to the old lady, who, using the first great cooking-pot as a base, began to build higher and higher, calling down all the time, 'A few more, and I think I'll be high enough to see. . . .'

This is one of those stories that can be stretched out as long as you wish; and the native story-tellers love to make it last a very long time, so that the old lady gets higher and higher, and the pile of

cooking-pots begins to look as though it will totter and crash down at any moment. But eventually the boy has to tell the old lady that there are no more pots to be found. But she calls down to him and says, 'Find just one more, a nice big one should be enough.'

'But there are no more left in the village, and the only big one is this one at the bottom.'

'Well, send that one up, quickly.'

So the boy puts his hand to the pot which forms the base for all the others, and gives it a tremendous pull.

And the old lady? Well, you can imagine what happened to her! The African folk love to laugh at her downfall, and after every one has enjoyed laughing at her expense, the story-teller usually ends by adding, 'And that is the reason why, to this day, no one has ever discovered what God is like.'

An amusing story, no doubt; but it really isn't true—not those words at the end of it at least. And my missionary friend, whenever he hears it, has to add, as any Christian may, 'But you see, we *do* know what God is like, for we know that Jesus is the Son of God, and Jesus Christ has shown us what His Father is like.'

Once, when I had been the minister of a church for just a few weeks, my father paid me a visit. The next Sunday morning, after the service in church, he was greeted by an unknown member of the congregation who amazed him by addressing him by his name. 'Oh', said the stranger, 'I know who you are. I may never have met you before, but you see I have met your son, and he's the very image of you.' That, I believe, was what

St. Paul meant when he said that Jesus was the image of the invisible God. Jesus had introduced us to God by showing the same love for us that God shows. All that we have learned about the way Jesus cares for us has led us to know that God the Father cares for us in the same way.

That is why, during Advent, we shall be thanking God for the gift of His Son.

### Hearing God Speak<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, Adolphus Tompkinson likes going to Church. I say on the whole, because there are times when he doesn't feel like it a bit. One Sunday, when he felt like that, he asked his mother: 'Mummy, what is the point of going to Church? What do we do it for?' His mother gave a very large sigh (I expect your mothers do sometimes—you must be extraordinary children if they don't) and then she said: 'Well, you see, there are so many reasons, but one of them is this. We go to hear God speak to us. He doesn't speak as I am speaking to you now, of course. It is in a different way, but He makes an impression on our minds which, after all, is what we speak for.'

'Oh, I see,' said Adolphus, and being a reasonable sort of fellow he left it at that and went quite cheerfully to Church.

When he got back, his mother asked him how he had got on.

'Oh,' he said, 'it was all right. We had some good hymns—hymns I know—reading from the Bible, and a nice talk from the Minister. Oh yes, it was all right, thank you. But you are wrong, you know.'

'Wrong?' said his mother. 'Wrong about what?'

'Well, about God speaking. He didn't.'

And then Adolphus's mother gave another even deeper sigh.

'Oh,' she said, 'I see I shall have to tell you the story of the radio men.'

Well, Adolphus loves a story, whatever it is about, so he said, 'Yes, do. What's it about?'

'It all began,' said his mother, 'with an advertisement for some radio operators. They were told to apply to a certain place at a certain time, and, in due course, they appeared and sat in a room and waited to be interviewed in a room which lay beyond. As they sat waiting, a sound could be heard going on in the office. They were all so used to this sound, that none of them seemed to take much notice, but after a little while one of them suddenly got up, walked over to the door leading

to the inner room, knocked on the door, and opened it. He went inside and shut the door behind him. As he shut the door, the noise stopped. The others looked a bit surprised, but did nothing. A few moments later the man who had left them returned to the room from the inner office and said to them: 'It's all right, boys, you can go home. I've got the job'. "But," they said, "that's not fair. He hasn't seen us; he hasn't even spoken to us." "Oh yes, he has," said the man who had got the job. "Did you hear that Morse going on just now?" "Oh, we didn't take much notice of that," they said. "We hear it so often." "Well," said the man, "I *did* listen, and what the Morse said was this: 'The first man to hear this message and come into my office gets the job'. Well, I heard the message, I went into the office and I got the job. So you can all go home."'

That was the end of the story, and Adolphus said: 'Yes, that's a good story, but what's it to do with me?'

'Well,' his mother said, 'you remember telling me that you went to Church this morning and you didn't hear God speak? Well, I warned you that it would not be in the way that I am speaking to you now. He was speaking all the time, but you didn't hear Him any more than those men in that office heard the man who spoke to them through the Morse code. But you could have heard Him. He was speaking all the time through the hymns, through the reading of the Bible—we call it the Word of God—and through the talk that the Minister gave. All the time God was speaking, but you didn't hear. Perhaps next time you go you will be listening, on the look-out, as the man who got the radio job was, and then I believe you will hear God speaking.'

### The Christian Year

#### FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT

#### Like a Thief

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL FREDERIC GREEVES,  
M.A., DIDSBURY COLLEGE, WESTBURY-ON-TRYM

'But know this, that if the householder had known at what hour the thief was coming, he would have been awake and would not have left his house to be broken into. You also must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect.'—Lk 12<sup>39f</sup>. (R.S.V.).

To-day, Christians everywhere should wish each other 'A happy New Year'. The Christian year begins afresh, and what a wonderful beginning it is! The message of this Advent Sunday could hardly be made plain to those who know nothing of the gospel, but it becomes more full of meaning

<sup>1</sup> Paul Morton-George, *Adolphus Tompkinson*, 9. This volume is reviewed and most warmly commended in 'Literature' this month.

each year for those who are growing up in the Christian life.

I always think of Advent Sunday as being something like the overture to a great opera, or like a prologue to a drama. It announces, in one opening proclamation, the theme of the greatest Drama in the world, to borrow Dorothy Sayers' vivid description of the story which the gospel tells. Just as those who have often seen an opera are all the more excited by the overture, so the more we have learnt about the Christian gospel the more thrilling is the Advent prologue.

Like the gospel to which the message of this day is an introduction, Advent Sunday speaks to us about Jesus Christ, and (as the word '*Advent*' suggests) it speaks to us about the *coming* of Christ. But this is not Christmas Day, and we should not confuse the two festivals. Advent Sunday looks *especially* not to the beginning, but to the end; not to Christ's first coming but to His last coming. It reminds us that we only begin to understand the story of Jesus when we think about the End.

Most of us know, however, that Christian people have often misheard the Advent Sunday message. They have tried to picture *how* the end of this world will come about, and *when* it will happen, and they have done this in spite of our Lord's clear statement that even He did not know when the end would come. Afraid of making that mistake, many of us Christians to-day refuse to think about the End at all, or we even pretend to ourselves that it will not happen. That is equally foolish. There is one fact about the End of which the Advent Sunday gospel makes us certain; it is the all-important fact—Jesus Christ Himself will be *the meaning of the End*. How and when He will finish His work we do not know; we know that He *will* finish it. Precisely what it means to say that He will 'come again', we cannot possibly understand; we must focus our minds upon the fact that it is HE who will come again.

In our text, Jesus tells us one fact—and only one—about the *manner* of His coming. He does this by using a most unexpected, I may even say a most daring, illustration. He says that the manner of His coming will be that of a *thief*. It is all the more remarkable that He should have put it in that way when we recall other words which, according to St. John, He also said: 'The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy; I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly'. Jesus did not mean that He would come *as* a thief (to be a thief); He meant that His coming would be unexpected, secret, *like* that of a thief.

This vivid image seems to have been firmly fixed in the minds of the early Christians. We find it in 1 Thessalonians and in 2 Peter, and it is quoted (in a parenthesis) in the sixteenth chapter of the

Revelation, a chapter that we find very hard to understand: 'Lo! I am coming like a thief! Blessed is he who is awake, keeping his garments that he may not go naked and be seen exposed!' When we recollect that the 'garments' are the spiritual clothes, 'the robes of righteousness', that Christ gives to us, this part of this difficult chapter in Revelation becomes plain.

It is, however, not easy for us to recapture this way of thinking of Christ's coming as being like that of a thief. Perhaps we can be helped to do so if we think about some other meanings of 'the coming of Christ', before we think about what we call the last Advent. I suggested that the message for this Sunday is like an overture, and we know how an overture often incorporates many of the musical themes which will be heard in the actual opera. So it is with Advent Sunday. In a sense, it is about the whole story of Christ; and, therefore, it is about all His 'comings'.

It is certainly about His *first coming* into the world, and although, like children waiting for Christmas, we must wait in patience for that festival, Advent Sunday does tell us that Christmas is coming; we can almost hear the bells ringing. The birth of Jesus was the most prepared-for of all events, and the Old Testament is about those preparations; but, when He came, it was in an unexpected way. It was as though He slipped unobtrusively into the world, a baby 'thief'.

Or, we think of His coming again from the grave in His *resurrection*; stealing upon Mary in the Garden, quietly appearing where His disciples were met together, walking alongside two of them, always coming in an hour that they knew not.

Yet, again, we may consider His *coming to an individual* in the astonishing experience that we call 'conversion', or in one of those moments of intense awareness which He grants to some of His followers, moments that a hymn writer described as 'glimpses of His presence'. We must never seek to compel Him to 'come' to us in this way; when He does so, it is to astonish us by His breaking in upon us.

*Death*, for a Christian man or woman, has often been described as 'going to be with Christ'; it is equally fittingly spoken of as Christ's coming, to take us to His Father's house. 'I will come again and will take you to myself, that where I am you may be also'. This advent of the Lord, too, is at an hour that we expect not.

It is not surprising, therefore, that what we call His *last Advent* should be described as it is in our text. Whether the 'end' is for us our individual death, or whether our 'end' is part of what Christians call The End are not matters about

which we should speculate. Nor, as I have said, must we attempt to give any meaning in terms of *time* and *space* to the final coming of Christ. The first Christians had to learn that they must not think in that way. To do so is to destroy the whole significance of the fact that Christ's coming is always a breaking in, at a time and in a way that nobody can guess beforehand. What matters is that we should *look forward* to His coming and be *ready* for Him.

That is the great message of Advent Sunday, and it is one that has been central in the thoughts of most Christians until recent times. Throughout the Christian year—the one that is past and (if we remain in this life) the one that begins to-day—we learn *how* we may get ready for Christ. Or, rather, we learn how we can be *made* ready, for He gives us the 'clothes' in which we may fittingly greet Him; He makes us the kind of people to whom He may come.

And so, we can *look forward* to His coming; to His coming into our hearts, to His coming in our dying, to His coming 'at the last'. He comes *like* a thief, but not *as* a thief. He breaks in, and that startles us and, if we are unprepared, makes us afraid. But as in the days of His resurrection appearances, He always says, 'Be not afraid'. He comes that we may have abundant life. We sometimes say to a friend, 'The house is always open, do drop in, at any time!'. It was something like that which the first Christians often said: 'Come, Lord Jesus!'

## SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT—BIBLE SUNDAY

### The Word and the Lord

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D.,  
TH.M., GLASGOW

'And Jesus . . . as his custom was went, into the synagogue on the sabbath day . . . and there was delivered unto him the book. . . . And he opened the book . . . And he closed the book . . . and the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him.'—Lk 4<sup>14, 16, 17, 20</sup>.

'A good book', said Milton, 'is the precious life-blood of a Master Spirit.' The written word is mighty for good or evil. It is a way whereby man can engage in the typically human task of communication, of communication not only with his contemporaries but with his posterity. Words should not casually or carelessly be committed to paper.

To be a little nationalistic for a moment, it is

probably true to say that in no country is this better realized than in Scotland. The learned professions have no longer, here or elsewhere, the financial rewards which once they enjoyed. Yet, in this country, the most important question about a child is still 'Is he fond of his books'. 'The lad o' pairts' is not the one with promise of manual dexterity or business acumen. He is the lad who is fond of learning. More than to any other, we owe this to John Knox, who, in his greatness, saw that the preservation of the gospel, in its purity, depended on education. So he strove fiercely to preserve as much of the patrimony of the Church as he could, that the village dominie and the masters in the grammar schools and the professors in the universities might be paid. Thus, it was from regard for 'The Book' that the Scottish respect for books in general arose. To this day, in some areas, 'to take the book' can mean only one thing—to prepare for family devotions. Most arguments in the Scottish churches cannot proceed far before there is recourse to the Bible.

Perhaps this stubborn attachment to the objective, unchanging printed charter of our Faith, explains why exotic aberrations from it have never flourished long in our dour, northern soil. In particular, it may explain why, with rare exceptions, wild speculation about our Lord's Advent have found little credence in these parts. So may it long continue! We should not venture forth into new experiments in church life, or trust ourselves to distinguish between the leading of the Holy Spirit and the vaporous delusions of a fevered brain, unless first we search the Scriptures. The custom, too, of reading the plain, clear warrant for the Sacraments in the Word of Scripture before their celebration is entirely sound.

All of this, this willingness to be servants of the Word, is completely in accord with the custom of the Early Church, and of the Old Testament religion out of which it emerged. Jesus did not break with the tradition of reverence for the Scriptures. He knew the Old Testament and loved it. His own self-consciousness was informed by what He found there, and He fortified Himself with it, from His first temptation to His last. All that He had to reveal of the Father and of Himself He revealed within the context of the Old Testament, and He adhered to the customs of the synagogue in saying there only what could be said in explanation or illustration of the Scriptures. This is the ancient and honourable origin of our custom of preaching from a text. This is precisely what Jesus was doing in the Nazareth synagogue on the day to which this passage refers. First, before all, there was delivered unto Him the Book. So He began. So we should begin, not with our own

deas, but with something quite objective and specific. Our religion is not something we find in the misty recesses of our own souls. It is not a matter of intuition or tradition. It is not first of all experience. It is something given. We are tied inescapably to the Book. Here we begin.

2. But we do not end here. When the book was delivered unto Jesus, He opened it, and that, surely, in no merely literal sense. Books, as such, are nothing in themselves. They are a poor substitute for life. They have value, only in accordance with the degree in which they point beyond themselves. For, finally, all values are personal. Like plays and lectures and music, books are meaningful only if they are meaningful for some person.

What makes the Bible the Word of God is not some magic in the paper and ink of which it is made. It is the Word of God only as it is the Word of the living God to *man*. Often Servicemen, during the War, used to show their chaplains the New Testaments they had been given, pointing with pride to their mint condition. They seemed to regard them as a sort of talisman, able to impart sanctity—or perhaps safety—if only they were carried about. Something of the same attitude is to be found with those who have an exaggerated reverence for the mere words of Scripture. But the Bible not only has to be opened, it has to be opened up. Christ's sermon in Nazareth consisted of the proof that the word of prophecy was fulfilled for His hearers, vividly and livingly, that day in Himself. This is what every sermon should do. It should show how the Bible is for ever pointing beyond itself, to Him who is its Lord and ours, who is the Word of God made flesh.

It is not true to say that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. Much of the weakness and divisions of Protestantism arise from this very attitude, from an addiction to the letter of the Scripture, over against its spirit. We have the right to call the Bible the Word of God only when we ourselves have found it to be so, only when we have reached through it and beyond it, to Him who is the Lord of the Bible and of all life.

Beyond the sacred page  
I seek Thee, Lord;  
My Spirit pants for Thee,  
O living Word.

3. And so when Jesus had opened the book, He closed it and the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on *Him*. The Bible's value is real, but it is subordinate and temporal. Derived from Christ, it will pass away when we see Him face to face. It is the mirror in which we see but darkly, and when that which is perfect is

come, its usefulness will be at an end. We may be sure that in Nazareth that day, when the Book was closed, it would soon be forgotten, and the synagogue itself. Soon there would be only He who spake as never man spake and those to whom He spake. The promise of the second Advent is that, once again, it will be like that. There will be only Christ and men. All else will have passed away.

Our little systems have their day;  
They have their day and cease to be;  
They are but broken lights of thee,  
And thou, O Lord, art more than they.

The Lord of the Book will, at that day, be seen in all the perfection of His beauty and glory, and this Book will be eclipsed like a candle in the mid-day sun. Final values are not literary, or æsthetic, but personal, for finally only persons will remain. There were Christians before the New Testament was written, and there will be Christians when it has passed away, when the tally of the saints is complete, and the Church militant has become the Church triumphant, when Christ shall be all in all.

Before he marries, many a man carries a photograph of his sweetheart in his pocket-book. Not many men carry a picture of their wives. Why? Because they do not love them? No, indeed. It is just that they see the dear originals every day. When the ship is launched, the drawings are filed away and the templates stored. When we've reached our journey's end, we do not need map and compass any more. So shall it be in heaven.

there  
Spend in pure converse our eternal day;  
Think each in each, immediately wise;  
Learn all we lacked before; hear, know, and say  
What this tumultuous body now denies;  
And feel, who have laid our groping hands away;  
And see, no longer blinded by our eyes.

No one should ever despise books—least of all the Book of Books. Without it, we cannot even begin the pilgrim journey. But there is, within us all, a desire, which even the Bible cannot still, a restlessness which even its wonderful words cannot quiet, a hunger and a thirst which it cannot satisfy, which cannot really be satisfied, short of the fulfilment of the Advent promise of Christ—'I go to prepare a place for you. . . . I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also'. 'I shall be satisfied', said the Psalmist, 'when I awake, with thy likeness'—and so shall I, and so shall you.

'He closed the book, and the eyes of all were fastened on him.'

## THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT

## The Worshipper's Ladder

BY THE REVEREND T. GLYN THOMAS, M.A.,  
WREXHAM

'The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.'—Ps 19<sup>1</sup>.

'In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.'—Is 6<sup>1</sup>.

'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?'—I Co 3<sup>16</sup>.

Though the text is very scattered, the point is at once clear—God in His universe, God in His sanctuary, God in the heart. The worshipper's ladder!

How vital it is that we should climb all the stairs! Many are prepared to climb from ground-level on to the first rung of the worshipper's ladder who are not prepared to climb any higher. But that is not Christianity but rather a kind of Pantheism, when God is nothing more than a 'life force' in His universe. God had no need to send His Only Begotten Son to this world to live and die and rise again in order to tell people that He is a 'life force' in the universe. People had long known that. There are many too—not so many, but still many—who are willing to climb on to the second rung of the ladder—God in His sanctuary—but who will not climb higher. But if He is no more than a presence in the sanctuary, that, too, is not Christianity, but rather a kind of Judaism. And not Judaism at its best. So the appeal is always: 'Come up higher'. Nothing is adequate and sufficing save God in the heart.

If any man knew that God is a God of the universe, that man was St. Paul. You need do nothing more than read the eighth chapter in his letter to the Romans to be convinced of that. And if any one had experienced God as a presence in His sanctuary it was that great Jew, a 'Hebrew of the Hebrews'. And yet it is he who says to us: 'Know ye not that ye *are* the temple of God'—not, mark you, that you '*have* a temple of God'—and that the Spirit of God dwelleth *in* you—not, you observe, *around* you.

Let us, then, attempt to climb the worshipper's ladder in our imagination. Consider the first rung of this ladder. 'The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork'.

And how grand and glorious He is in His universe! But it isn't fashionable to say this nowadays! If you would see God, we are told, don't look for Him in His universe. It will give you a false impression.

But I like Elizabeth Barrett Browning when she sings:

Earth's crammed with heaven  
And every common bush afire with God.

I think I have felt the Presence and seen the burning at times.

Don't you think our Lord used to see His Father in the universe? 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow'. Who clothes them in such magnificent array? 'If God so clothe the grass of the field'. It is God who does it! 'Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap . . . yet your heavenly Father feedeth them'. He saw His Father everywhere.

The Bible doesn't say that the sun rises. What the Bible says is that God raises it. 'He makes his sun to rise.' G. K. Chesterton, that brilliant mind, used to say that he believed that that is how the sun rises every day. 'God was so pleased with what it did yesterday that He says to it every morning, "Go on, do it again!"'

But, glorious though He is in His universe, it will not suffice. We can only behold His 'handy-work' there.

Does God love me? The universe, for all its magnificent glory, has not a word to say in answer. But that is what I want to know more than all. Will God forgive me my sin? The heavens, for all that they declare, have nothing to declare about that. Some one has gathered the whole point into one brief but pregnant sentence: 'God is in Nature, but the Nature of God is in Christ'.

Think again of the second rung on the worshipper's ladder. 'I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple'. How great and glorious is God in His sanctuary! Why is it that so many think they can dispense with the God of the sanctuary? Isn't every place a place of worship? they ask. Can't I go down to the sea or up into the mountain and meet and worship Him there? But the people who are most likely to find God everywhere are the people who come purposely to seek Him somewhere. And the people who are most likely to consecrate every hour are the people who come purposely to consecrate certain hours.

And when I get an opportunity, I say to my friends, 'Well, I have a text-book for my life. You could read it through in an evening. But I order my life by it. And my text-book tells me that the holiest and the best that our world has ever known went to the synagogue on the Sabbath "according to His custom". And you think you can dispense with a means of grace that He employed'.

And how odd are people's reasons for not frequenting a place of worship. 'Look who goes there', they say. But were all the people who

worshipped with our Lord in the synagogue at Nazareth perfect people?

And yet, when all that, and much more, is said, it will not suffice. If we are content with the God of the sanctuary only, religious compartmentalism lies in wait for us like a snare.

Why didn't the priest in the story of the Good Samaritan leave everything and go to the help of some one in dire need? Wasn't it because he dared not? What if the man had died on his hands? He would have been polluted and would not have been able to go back to the Temple to carry on the service. Do you see the scathing thing that our Lord is saying? The very thing that should have made him human and humane—his religion—was the very thing that made him inhuman.

And so the gospel calls us to 'come up higher'. God is glorious in His universe. God is holy in His temple. But no God is sufficient save God in the heart. 'Know ye not that ye *are* the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth *in* you?'

And if we have Him in our hearts we shall find Him everywhere. If you take Him in your heart out into the world, you will surely find Him there. You are never sure to find Him unless you do. If you bring Him in your heart to your place of worship, there will not be a service at which you will not find Him there. You are never sure to find Him unless you do. Turn the pages of any history book and you will meet Him in the story of man's life and work upon the earth, if you have Him in your heart. You are never sure to meet Him if you have not; there have been many who have failed to.

The revival that we need is a revival of true worship, the worship that, as William Temple held, means flooding the mind with the truth of God, submitting the conscience to the direction of God, opening the heart to the love of God, bowing the will to the purpose of God, consecrating the life to the service of God. It is the cleansing, purifying worship that makes our lives fit temples for the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit.

#### FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT

### Contented Amid the Worst Because Certain of the Best

BY THE LATE REVEREND ARTHUR A. COWAN, D.D.,  
EDINBURGH

'I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, *therein* to be content.'—Ph 4<sup>11</sup> (R.V.).

This is the correct meaning of the original Greek manuscript. St. Paul was not content *with* his present harassing position but content *in* it. He

accepted it cheerfully as a temporary phase, not as a permanent plight, as God's will for the time being but not God's will for ever. He claims that faith in the God revealed in Jesus Christ has cured him of any crippling doubt and given him such great expectations that he can gladly take the rough with the smooth. So what he is really saying here is this: 'I have learned in whatsoever state I am, however galling the circumstances and however tormenting the predicament, *therein* to be content', because I know that all the time I am making for something better. His eyes were fixed on a higher destination, he was moving on in the service of Jesus Christ, and that made the present hardship bearable, something one could feel content about. One can be contented amid the worst when one is certain of the best.

Take a modern instance of this. In his book, *The Ascent of Everest*, Sir John Hunt tells of the risks and privations of the climb, walls of ice to be scaled, terrifying crevasses to be crossed, the slowing down of one's energy by the rarified atmosphere beyond a twenty-one thousand feet altitude, the freezing wind blowing through the tents at night like a knife cutting tired bodies to the bone, yet amid months of such ordeal his team of men never grumbled, and why? Not because they were content *with* the surroundings which dared them but because they were content *in* them. They were getting nearer their objective—to conquer Everest—and that enabled them to accept the transient pain, the fleeting danger cheerfully. What sustained them was a shared faith that their undertaking was immensely worthwhile.

But the Apostle was making a bigger venture of faith and stepping out on the greater enterprise of salvation. He was engaged in Christianizing the heathen world, evangelizing pagan civilization, and making it more clean, more human, more brotherly. Because he could not tolerate abuses and wrongs, could not put up with things as they were, he was ready to put up with personal discomfort and distress meantime. The making of a more Christian order was the prospect that goaded him to endure personal hardship cheerfully. The lasting reality which he trusted was God's saving purpose in Christ—that sustained the Apostle.

O happy day, that fixed my choice  
On Thee, my Saviour and my God!

'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.' The contentment St. Paul had achieved was not a shirking of the Cross but a bearing of the Cross. There can be no happier future by condoning evil, and there can be no Divine blessing on the desertion of great causes and great principles. There can be no progress by acquiescence in what is unjust, uncaring, and

unforgiving. This is an appropriate message for the Fourth Sunday in Advent, when we are looking forward to the joy of salvation. We can be content when we are confident about the arrival of a great deliverance and the glad greetings of Christmas. St. Paul's spirit was satisfied, his mind was relieved, when he paid the price of his moral and religious loyalties, just as it satisfied the Everest climbers when they did not hide from the challenge but answered it and resolved to conquer.

One of the major lessons we must learn is to accept life. We must be reconciled to the way the world is constituted by the God in whom we believe, the God who involved Himself so deeply in human affairs that He sent His Son to redeem them. Advent is a fresh assurance of God's saving love. To accept life is therefore to accept the limitations of our lot without any sense of grievance. Freya Stark, the noted traveller in the Middle East, tells in a recent book how thankful she is that she was brought up to do without many things. 'Another quality', she writes, 'produced at first by my father's rigorous teaching of endurance and, secondly, by the financial ups and downs of our youth, was a certain indifference to circumstances. I had realized, by wanting them, how desirable many things are, but had also come to see how much of life can be enjoyed without them.'

Further, to accept life means to accept other people. Would it not be rather absurd to expect

all our associates to be ideal persons, birds of Paradise, without a flaw in them? We are not always so admirable ourselves that we can demand admirable conduct from foreign nations, business acquaintances, and even our own family circle. Ponder these words of Mark Rutherford: 'We are not to wait until we have something perfect to love. Only when I got older did I discover the duty of accepting life as God has made it, and thankfully accepting any scrap of love offered me, however imperfect. A man's love should not fail towards his fellows, no more than that love failed that was spent on the disciples'. We should take people as they are, faulty but lovable human creatures, and enjoy such response as they make, which is probably deeper than we suppose. That will give us a contented heart, for it will ally us with God as co-workers with Him, and we shall be moving on and up with Him to the top, to conquer our Everest. 'I have learned, in whatsoever state I am', by whatever sort of companions surrounded, 'therein to be content', as a stage on the way to some fuller disclosure of God's purpose.

Our future thus depends upon our Christian faith. How much we can stand and overcome is determined by the extent of our confidence in God's unfailing love as it is opened up to us in touch with Jesus Christ. Advent, the coming of Christ into our life, makes us contented amid the worst because we are certain of the best.

## Recent Foreign Theology

**The Essenes.** Ever since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls there has been a considerable revival of interest in the Essenes, because so many scholars have connected the sect of the Scrolls with them in some form or other. Dr. del Medico, who published a highly original book on the Scrolls in French more than a year ago,<sup>1</sup> which has now been translated into English,<sup>2</sup> has issued another work, in which he develops one element of the thesis of the earlier work, and denies that there ever were any Essenes. It therefore bears the title *The Myth of the Essenes*.<sup>3</sup> In this work the author traverses the literary sources that mention the Essenes from the beginning of the Christian era to the Middle Ages, and it will be found to have real value by reason of its assembly of material. It is more doubtful whether the

conclusions the author draws will find acceptance amongst scholars. He thinks the Essenes were born in the fertile imagination of Philo, and traces what he believes to be the history of the growth of the legend. The well-known passages in Josephus he holds to be interpolations, and finds the hand of more than one interpolator in widely separated ages. The trouble is that his theory demands too many interpolators, and at too many points in Josephus's writings. At the same time, his collection of material will be valued by many readers who do not share the conclusions he draws.

**Collected Papers of Professor Humbert.** Professor P. Humbert of Neuchâtel, now seventy-three years old, has published several volumes in the course of his life, and in particular has had a notable share in the discovery of cultic and liturgical elements in the prophetic books, which is one of the characteristics of much present-day study.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Enigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte* [1957].

<sup>2</sup> *The Riddle of the Scrolls* [1958].

<sup>3</sup> *Le Mythe des Esséniens* [1958]. Plon, Paris; Fr. 1500.

Like most scholars he has also published many papers in scattered periodicals, which may not be accessible to many students, who will welcome the collection of thirteen of these in a single volume,<sup>1</sup> to which Professor W. Baumgärtner has written a Preface, appraising the contribution of Professor Humbert to Hebrew and Biblical studies. Most of the studies here collected are linguistic and grammatical, dealing with the phrase הִנֵּנִי אֵלֶיךָ, with the participle, וְ, and נָכַר in Proverbs, and שָׁמַר, זָלַל, בָּרָא, קָנָה, אֶבְיֹן, the verb פָּעַל, and its derivatives. Both for the wealth of material they assemble and for the conclusions the author draws from it, these deserve to be preserved, and will often be used by scholars and students. In addition there is a study of Gn 1, dealing with the word בְּרָאשִׁית, the image of God, and the relation of the two accounts of Creation in the first two chapters of the Bible. Another study treats of the relation of Gn 1 and Ps 104 in the Israelite liturgy of the New Year festival, while another is on the Book of Ruth. The opening study consists of a lecture first published in 1924 on Renan, in which the reputation of Renan as a scholar and a Hebraist was defended against the charges of superficiality which were current at the time, and in which the achievements as well as the defects of Renan were fully recognized. The final study is an expansion of one published in 1955, dealing with the Book of Job, in which the whole Book is regarded as a unity, coming from the hand of a single author. This is a point of view seldom found in modern scholarly work, and it is sure to be read with interest.

**Non-Massoretic Hebrew Grammar.** For many years there has been much interest in the various pre-Massoretic systems of vocalization, and the light they shed on Hebrew grammar. This interest was largely fostered by Professor P. Kahle, who before the War directed in Bonn the researches of a number of younger scholars in this field. Now a Finnish scholar, A. Murtonen, who has received help and encouragement from Professor Kahle, has studied a number of liturgical texts from the Cairo Genizah, and published the result of his researches in a study of the light they shed on non-Massoretic Hebrew Grammar.<sup>2</sup> The book is

photographed from typescript, since its publication had to be at the author's expense, and its appearance is unprepossessing. It contains an Introduction on the manuscripts used, and a systematic study of the grammar as it appears here, with an appendix by Dr. G. J. Ormann, of Jerusalem. There is a translation of some difficult Piyuṭim (liturgical poems) by Dr. Murtonen, and a further translation from Qalir by Dr. Ormann, while some facsimiles and sixty pages of Hebrew text complete the volume. It is a pity that original work of this kind on hitherto unpublished texts so difficult of access could not be more worthily produced, but the author is deserving of gratitude for his contribution to the history of the Hebrew language.

**Immortality in the Psalms.** The unrelenting pen of Mgr. Coppens has given us a study of the *Belief in Immortality in the Psalms*<sup>3</sup> in Flemish, with a French résumé, published in the Proceedings of the Royal Flemish Academy. Here the author discusses the three psalms 16, 49, and 73, of which he offers translations at the end of the study. What he seeks to establish is whether the hope of immortality, expressed in Wis 3<sup>1-4</sup> has any antecedents in the Old Testament. He finds, as others have done, that of the three psalms in which these antecedents have been found, Ps 49 offers the clearest evidence for such antecedents, while Ps 16 offers the weakest support, and is indeed to be dismissed for this purpose. Between these stands Ps 73, which despite the textual difficulties Coppens finds to set forth the hope of eternal union with God. He then goes on to the Dead Sea Scrolls and argues that the development of faith in the immortality of the soul amongst the Qumran sectaries supports the view that the roots of this faith are found in the Old Testament. Despite the claims to find foreign influences in the Scrolls Coppens prefers a more cautious approach and to look first within the Old Testament for the sources of their ideas. Finally, he argues that the Messianic interpretation of Ps 16 may be maintained by finding here the *sens plénier* behind the literal sense. Here Mgr. Coppens is on his old ground, and applying a principle for which he has often argued. The study closes with a full bibliography—in which Coppens always excels.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University

<sup>1</sup> *Opusculs d'un Hébraïsant* [1958]. (*Mémoires de l'Université de Neuchâtel*, xxvi.) University of Neuchâtel; Swiss Fr. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Materials for a non-Massoretic Hebrew Grammar: Liturgical Texts and Psalm Fragments with the so-called Palestinian Punctuation* [1958]. Distribution by Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, Helsinki; \$5.00.

<sup>3</sup> *Het Onsterfelijkheidsgeloof in het Psalmboek* [1957]. (*Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, xix. [1957], No. 3). Brussels.

## Entre Nous

### Signposts in the Search for God

Any preacher who publishes a book of sermons takes a risk, for the spoken word and the written word are two very different things, and the print of a book can do little to reproduce the personal impact of a great preacher's presence. In *Sermons Preached in a University Church* (Abingdon Press; \$3.75) Dr. George A. Buttrick has given us twenty-six sermons which were originally preached in Harvard University Memorial Church. Dr. Buttrick is well aware of 'the opaqueness of print', but there is no doubt that his sermons 'get across' in print, as they must have done in speech. These sermons are first and foremost designed for the congregation to which they were preached; they are university sermons. But let no intending reader think that they are narrowly and aridly academic. They have in them the thrill and the passion which will make them moving and convincing to any congregation.

Dr. Buttrick knows the wistful uncertainty of the present situation. 'Thanks to some one', said Katherine Mansfield. 'But who?' And it was the same Katherine Mansfield who wrote to Dorothy Brett of our human need: 'God is now gone for all of us. Yet we must believe, and not only that; we must carry our weakness and our sin and our devilish-ness to Somebody.' There was the thoughtful woman student with her question: 'So many voices! Which shall I follow?' Dr. Buttrick tells of his little granddaughter Anne looking at a picture of her small cousin Karen. It had been taken with Karen looking into the sun, so her eyes were almost closed and her face puckered. 'Why is she so muddled?' she asked—a question that might well be asked of this generation. Dr. Buttrick knows the deep pessimism, which, although it would never use the phrase, has rediscovered 'original sin'. Robert Penn Warren wrote:

I have long since come to the firm and considered conclusion

That love, all love, all kinds, descriptions, and shapes,  
Is but a mask to hide the brute face of fact,  
And that fact is the immitigable ferocity of self.

There's no forgiveness for our being human.

It is the inexpugnable error. It is

... the one thing we have overlooked

In our outrageous dreams and cunningest contrivances.

It is to find at least some of the answers that Dr. Buttrick sets out. 'When the sceptic lecturer asked pretentiously, "What could be better than

seeking the truth?" the old lady in the front row made the obvious answer, "Why, finding it, course"'. Dr. Buttrick's solutions are not new, but they are true.

There is the need of prayer. Prayer is 'the movement of God's life in us'. 'There is no proof of prayer apart from praying.' 'Some one has said that though the aisles of any church are dirty, only a man on his knees can clean them.'

There is the need of faith. 'Faith is the movement of our finite life toward the beckoning of the infinite promise.' Because we are human frustration and limitation must be part of life. The Christian accepts the frustration and yet cleaves to faith. Does that spell tension? 'Yes, the tension of a 'cello string which sings only when it is taut. The string is stretched between the infinite hope and the finite limitation.'

There is need of the Bible. 'The Bible is not "sermonizing"; it is a transcript of experience. That Book never evades "the tragic sense of life", and, therefore, never sentimentalizes or makes false promises.'

There is need of God. God never changes, whereas in science there are fashions so that the scientist could advise the librarian in search of space: 'Take any book of science more than ten years old and put it in the cellar'. In a serious illness Rudyard Kipling stirred restlessly and the nurse asked him, 'Do you want anything?' He murmured 'I want God'.

There is no other way than Jesus Christ. 'The Mosque of St. Sophia in Istanbul was originally a Christian Church, though the Christian symbols and inscriptions have been overlaid. A visitor noticed . . . that a picture of Christ . . . was showing through the covering paint; and the visitor exclaimed, almost despite himself, "He is coming back. You cannot blot him out!"'

The fear of war, the atomic bomb, the issue of pacifism stalk through this book. Here is a book which passionately, sympathetically, out of a heart that cares, seeks to give some signposts to those who are seeking the way—and it splendidly succeeds in its task.

On p. 55 *Grumaldi* should be *Grimaldi*; on p. 107 *unite* should be *untie*; a Scot and Burns lover may be pardoned for a *cri de coeur* that neither on p. 118 nor on any other page should Scotland's national poet be called *Bobbie Burns*! WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.